

# The Library

Fourth Series  
Vol. XI. No. 1.

June 1930

## THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE COMMEDIA DELL'ARTE: THE MISCELLANIES OF THE COMICI AND VIRTUOSI

By KATHLEEN M. LEA<sup>1</sup>



HE preliminary distinction between the *Commedia Erudita* and the *Commedia dell'Arte* which allots printed neo-classical comedies to the academicians, and the comedy of the masks to the 'comici' or professional improvisers, is necessary and convenient; but in so far as it ignores the reciprocal influences of professional and amateur performances it has led to some misconception of the nature of Italian popular drama. That there was considerable interaction may be proved by comparing the manuscript miscellanies of the 'comici' with the printed plays of the 'virtuosi'.

The books to which I should like to draw attention are a group of Italian comedies, some anonymous, some pseudonymous, some misattributed, many undated, and all issued in cheap popular editions between 1585 and 1700. They were classed apart by Quadrio as belonging to a mongrel tradition halfway between the popular and the academic drama: notices of the majority are included in the enlarged edition of Allacci's *Drammaturgia* (1755), but they have found no place in the histories of literature and have escaped the notice of historians

<sup>1</sup> Read before the Bibliographical Society, 20 January 1930.

## 2     *The Bibliography of the Commedia dell' Arte*

of the stage. Yet they are of considerable importance for any one interested in the development of Italian comedy in the seventeenth century, from the point of view either of the *Commedia erudita* or of the *Commedia dell'arte*. Their use of the masks of the improvised comedy suggests that they might be mines of information if only we could be sure of their relationship to the popular stage; and once that relationship is determined we should be in a position to use them as evidence of the influence of the professional on the printed drama. There have been some signs in the recent criticism of Adolfo Bartoli, Ferdinando Neri, and Benedetto Croce that historians of the Italian popular comedy are beginning to realize that there is here a rich seam unworked. It seems that at this point, by the non-bibliographical approach, some of the bibliographical knots may be loosened and the value of the plays for students of the drama of the Seicento reinstated.

### *Need for evidence supplementary to the 'scenari' and speech-miscellanies of the Commedia dell'Arte*

It is not for lack of materials that we welcome these plays as documents of the *Commedia dell'arte*. There are over 600 *scenari* extant and a number of miscellanies of speeches. If we are already embarrassed by this bulk, why trouble to claim the extra examples? Because it so happens that the greatest need in describing the *Commedia dell'arte* is for plans which will show us how to co-ordinate the material at our disposal. There can be no direct method of introduction, now that the practice of improvisation is dead. There have been stray experiments, but for most of us charades are the only form of extempore acting ever witnessed or tried. Charades leave an impression of tolerance, cheerful inefficiency, and *tours de force* which is quite a false analogy for the rigorous system devised by the Italian professionals. Cut off from any first-hand experience of

improvisation we are forced to go round to work, studying the *Commedia dell'arte* as best we can by selecting and piecing together the plots and speeches from ten or a dozen miscellanies. Needing diagrams to illustrate the instructions provided in a few treatises, we might expect to find them among the productions of the regular actors. That there are only about fifteen of such plays, and of these only seven extant in the scenario as well as the expanded form, is not surprising; it would hardly have been to the advantage of improvising professionals to sell their birthright in print.

The plays of the academicians who amused themselves by imitating the methods of the players appear to offer excellent supplementary material for a study of the *Commedia dell'arte* in action. But that printed plays composed by gentlemen amateurs in which the dialogue is fully expanded should be considered as documents of the professional improvised comedy involves a double contradiction, and it is hardly to be wondered that critics have neglected to dig them out, or that the critical reader should demand their credentials.

Happily, from the mass of *Commedia dell'arte* material of unquestioned authenticity, it is now possible to make a general comparison and to produce one or two test cases of the relationship of these plays to the traditions of the popular stage. The proof rests with the manuscript miscellanies of *scenari* and speeches.

*The form of a 'scenario'*

A scenario of the *Commedia dell'arte* is a theatrical document with a conventional literary form. As such it is to be distinguished on the one hand from the '*argomenti*' which precede the Renaissance comedies, and on the other from the prompter's plots, such as those preserved among the Dulwich papers. We have it on the authority of Gozzi<sup>1</sup> and Ricco-

<sup>1</sup> C. Gozzi, '*I Contratti Rotti*', *Opere*, iv, p. 35.

#### 4 *The Bibliography of the Commedia dell' Arte*

boni<sup>1</sup> that all Italian actors made use of the prompter's plot. A tidy specimen is printed at the end of Cotta's dialect comedy *La Pirlonea*<sup>2</sup> and is misleadingly called a scenario, but it is not to be confused with the scenario or 'soggetto' which is described by Perrucci in the *Arte Rappresentativa* (1699) as 'nothing but the scenic fabric woven from an 'argomento', to which is added the description of an action marked out into acts and scenes which is to be spoken and presented extempore by the performers'. Ideally the scenari indicate the subject-matter and style of conversation, the grouping and gesture which mark the critical moments of the plot: actually they give, with varying adequacy and detail, a scene-by-scene précis of the play.

They are ephemeral documents; few have survived in their original form, the majority are copied into big miscellanies. Only one collection of fifty at the beginning of the century, and a few separate scenari at the end, seem to have found their way into print; but the distinction is less rigid than at first might be supposed, since at least one, and probably two, of the manuscript miscellanies were prepared for publication. Others were written out by or for patrons of the improvised comedy.

##### *Printed Collections: Scala's 'Teatro' 1611*

On the whole the public fared better than the patron in the matter of detail. Flaminio Scala, whose *Teatro delle Favole Rappresentative* was printed in 1611, studied the reader's convenience. Each plot is preceded by its 'favola' explaining the previous adventures of the characters, whose part in the action is indicated with great skill and accuracy.

Besides being the only collection to be printed in the seventeenth century, this repertory is remarkable in respect of Scala's invention. So far as I know it is independent of the *Commedia*

<sup>1</sup> L. Riccoboni, *Histoire du théâtre italien*, 1728, p. 39.

<sup>2</sup> L. A. Cotta, *La Pirlonea*, 1666.



erudita. This is not to say that certain *motifs* are not to be traced to the 'novelle' and to Latin comedy, nor does it take into account the co-operation of his fellow-actors, but the use of such legitimate aids hardly damages his reputation for originality.

*Manuscript collections : Rome*

*Basilio Locatelli.* No such claim can be made for Basilio Locatelli, the compiler of the earliest manuscript miscellany extant. His two stout little volumes were discovered in the Biblioteca Casanatense by 'Carletta', alias A. Valeri, who spent four years preparing a critical edition which he abandoned in 1894 for a couple of articles in the *Nuova Rassegna*. The key for which Valeri found the lock was already in the possession of students of the *Commedia dell'arte*; for in 1782 Francesco Bartoli, in his *Notizie storiche de' Comici italiani*, reprints a list of titles given by Allacci in 1666 and has the following note :

'Locatelli the comedian flourished in 1650 and provided the stage with a manuscript work entitled "La Scena" divided into two parts. It contains a number of plots for comic, tragic, heroic, tragi-comic and pastoral plays to be played extempore. The original until 1654 was in the possession of Vincenzo Buzzi a professor of medicine in Rome.'

Further, De Boni asserts that many copies of Locatelli's manuscript were distributed among the players, who profited greatly thereby.<sup>1</sup>

From parish registers Valeri gleaned a few facts about the Locatelli family. Cesare, the elder brother, was an advocate. We know nothing of Basilio's profession ; but it is evident from his prefatory discourse that he must have turned in his grave when Bartoli wrote him down as 'Comico', with its accepted significance of a professional. Locatelli's whole purpose is to persuade us that 'il comico' is not the mercenary player, 'histrione infame', but 'l'accademico virtuoso'. He was

<sup>1</sup> *Biografia degl' artisti, Venezia, 1840, p. 573.*

## 6 *The Bibliography of the Commedia dell' Arte*

proud of being an amateur. In the first note to the reader he confides that

'as a recreation after my work I set myself to write the first part of my theatre of comic themes; and such pleasure have they afforded me as almost to compensate for the labour of restoring them to their present condition, for in the beginning they were so ill-arranged that hardly the sense or the first words were intelligible, so sadly had they been patched up and misused. They were despoiled of any dignity or ornament and in fact were so lost and abandoned that it seemed impossible to restore them to perfection. But at last I have clothed and adorned them, if not richly, at least decently, so that they may appear on the stage in any company without shame. . . . I hope, God willing, to compose a second part ere long.'

This was in 1618; in 1622 he pretends to retract; he prays God for grace to make some restitution for the many days wasted in such occupations; he is conscious of errors in this faulty stuff that he keeps by him to solace his own mind; he would burn it all. But in spite of the pricking conscience the clean copy of Part 2 is safe. His one comedy, *Li Sei Ritrovati*, was printed either piratically or posthumously by the bookseller Francesco Leone, in an undated edition of which there is a unique copy in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele. Valeri erred in hailing it as 'wholly new'; Locatelli had used the plot twice before in the scenari *Il Servo Ritornato* and *Il Servo Scacciato*.

At least twenty of the eighty scenari labelled 'Commedia' would be better described as farces; twelve tragi-comedies, eight pastorals, one heroic play, and two tragedies (or rather two dispositions of the same tragic theme) make up the tale of 103, from which, however, seven may be put aside as variants, for Locatelli made good use of the stage licence for reworking old material.

He is confessedly the renovator and collector. It seems likely that the scraps which he describes as 'talmente malcondotti, che intendere in alcun modo non si potevano' were some old theatrical plots or actors' notes. Precisely what fragments he may have had we do not know, but in the course of recon-

struction he referred freely to printed drama and narrative. In the scenario of *Orlando Furioso* he gives as many details of the action as appeal to him at the time, and then says frankly, 'All this may be read in such-and-such a canto of Ariosto'. Boccaccio is the ultimate, if not the immediate, source of two themes; Terence accounts for one and Plautus for four comedies; and the demonstrable debt of another nineteen to printed Italian plays only increases the suspicion of the originality of several others whose titular correspondents I have been unable to examine.

*Corsini miscellany.* Very different from the Casanatense manuscripts are the two volumes of scenari that in the seventeenth century belonged to Maurice of Savoy, now in the Biblioteca Corsini (Codices 45 G. 4, 5). They are the work of two transcribers: one who wrote a thick, clear, ugly, sloping hand was responsible for eighty-eight scenari; the other copied twelve in his small, wriggly, unformed writing. They used the same paper folded into sheets  $11\frac{1}{2}$  by  $8\frac{1}{2}$  inches and were evidently working in collaboration; for the numbers endorsed on the last two sheets of each scenario fit into an old scheme for 102 plays, in which sequence we now lack numbers 95 and 50. Each scenario constitutes a separate gathering, though they vary in size from 4 to 10 sheets; occasionally an end leaf is missing. In one respect this manuscript is unique: it is illustrated. Each title-page has a crude coloured drawing of some scene or typical group of personages from its scenario. Fifteen have been reproduced in Miclachevsky's *Commedia dell'Arte* (1927); eight more have been selected for this paper.

*Illustrations in the Corsini collection.* The title-page for *Le Burle di Fidele* (i. 38) where Zanni disguised as a necromancer keeps Trastullo in a circle, and pretending to exorcise his house from evil spirits persuades Gratiano to carry out the lover as a corpse, shows the simplest comedy setting which consists of a canvas of painted houses not unlike a row of bathing-boxes,

## 8 *The Bibliography of the Commedia dell' Arte*

arranged as a street or a square (pl. 1). In *L'Amor Costante* (ii. 11) a black-masked Trappolino lurks between the houses watching Pantalone stow his treasure underneath a projecting staircase, and Zanni behind the other wall waits to cheat his fellow-servant by substituting a coil of rope for the jewels in the casket (pl. 2).

For *Li Scambi* (ii. 7) another illustrator attempted a more elaborate perspective. To produce a more effective title-page he sacrifices dramatic accuracy. The five figures would not appear simultaneously in this relationship. He seems to have been content to sketch in the chief personages in typical attitudes. On one side Zanni pushes back Coviello (?) who comes in search of Flavia who has eloped with Lelio; on the other the Captain strides towards the simpering lovers but discreetly glances in the opposite direction (pl. 3). The multiple scene required for tragi-comedy appears in *L'Innocente Rivenduta* (ii. 12), where the regulation houses share the stage with the wood which appears in the list of properties. Doralice the heroine stands between Trappolino who flourishes a bloody handkerchief and Raiis the escaped Turk who is giving her a potion to cure the Duchess of her gout (pl. 4). The contrivance of a bridge suggests how the duel in the *Prencipe d'Altavilla* (ii. 32) may have been staged. A diminutive Gratiano acts as umpire, and Tamburino beats a drum to summon a better audience than the solitary female who has taken her place at the window (pl. 5).

The three pastorals (i. 45; 9; ii. 8) show a variety of background (pls. 6-8). In the first Proteus draped in seaweed is seen outside his grotto consoling the shepherd Fausto his son. In the second three satyrs cudgel Pantalone in a wood; and in the third, above a plainer landscape, the sky is cleared to leave room for Jove, who appears on his cloud vainly gesticulating to an obstinate enchantress who presides over the roasting of Pantalone, a clowning incident which is not explained in



XUM

LE BURLE  
DI FIDELE



COMEDIA





412

L'AMOR  
COSTANTE



COMEDIA



LI  
SCAMBI



COMMEDIA



L'INNOCENTE  
RIVENDUTA



TRAGICÔME



IL PRENCIPE  
D'ALTA VILLA



TRAGICOMED





224  
IL PROTEO



(PASTORALE)



LI TRE  
SATIRI



(PASTORA)



LA MAGA



PASTORALE



the scenario. The most complicated metamorphoses present no obstacle to the ingenuity of these artists. Nymphs disappear into bushes and trees, Zanni breaks open his stone, Sardinello emerges from the whale.

*Relationship of the Locatelli and Corsini collections.* Attention was first called to the Corsini collection by Zenatti,<sup>1</sup> who noticed that the titles of forty-four scenari corresponded to the Locatelli titles recorded by Allacci. In 1891 F. de Simone Brouwer printed two scenari whose titles, *Li Due Fratelli Rivali* and *La Trappolaria*, had misled him to suspect that they might be connected with Della Porta's comedies. He also brooded over the Locatelli titles and noticed two more duplicates.<sup>2</sup> Meanwhile Valeri knew of the existence of the Casanatense volumes, but waited until 1894 to produce them as a triumphant proof that the Corsini manuscript was nothing more than a redaction of the Locatelli collection, 'a patching together in telegraphic style of what may be considered as the most interesting body of scenari yet known'. Valeri finds 'nearly seventy' duplicates, prints as a specimen both versions of *L'Acconcia Serva*, annotates the list of Locatelli's titles referring them to their Corsinian counterparts, and thrusts aside the latter collection, arguing that since they cannot have been the actual 'fragmenti talmente malcondotti' on which Locatelli had drawn, they must be derived from the Casanatense scenari and so are of inferior interest. Since then the Corsini manuscript has been discredited, and scholars have hardly troubled to consult it. But Valeri's collation is not adequately stated and his conclusion is unreasonable.

In an attempt to re-establish the independence of this lively repertory I submit a rather tedious comparison of the two manuscripts.

Valeri shows the relationship between the collections by

<sup>1</sup> *Rivista critica della letteratura italiana*, ii, p. 156, 1885.

<sup>2</sup> *Giornale storico*, xv, p. 277.

printing the list of titles from Locatelli. He merely remarks that the Corsini copy is not complete, but says no more of the thirty odd scenari in the Corsini miscellany for which he can find no pairs. These at least should receive their due of interest and investigation, but they are not all. Among the seventy common to both manuscripts the degrees of correspondence are so variable that they may be divided into eight classes. Fifteen scenari in group A correspond entrance for entrance: here and there a name is altered, often the Corsini draft is so condensed that coincidence cannot be gauged detail for detail, but within a given outline they may be said to be identical. Eighteen in group B correspond at all critical points but show independence in the rearrangement of entrances, the explanation at the denouement, and in the occasional variation of 'lazzi'. In many cases the Corsini version is so scanty that one could hardly suppose it to be copied from Locatelli's manuscript; and if he was copying why should the transcriber trouble to change names and entrances and to make these changes consistent?

In the third group (C) the modifications increase: several scenes are changed: minor comic parts are developed. A final flourish or an extra explanatory excuse is added or omitted; the method of denouement is changed. There are eighteen scenari in this grade and another thirteen in group D where modifications of the same nature occur more freely. If the transcriber had access to the Locatelli scenari he managed to miss their spice and skill with remarkable obtuseness. Some of the changes might easily be due to the rearrangements made by a 'Capo-comico' to accommodate the talent at his disposal. This implies that there was at least an acting version between the two manuscripts. In the fifth group (E) of seven plays additions to the cast and changes of 'lazzi' necessitate a re-organization of the third act, and in some cases disturb the entrances throughout. New opening scenes are supplied. In



group F the contrasts outweigh the connexions: beyond what is obviously a common theme the four scenari are not related to Locatelli. In two plays of group C there is only a generic resemblance between the plots: while two others, the pairs of *Li due Scholari* and *Il Torneo*, which correspond in the dramatis personae and opening situations, for the rest of the play have no connexion whatever. Eleven comedies, six farces, two pastorals, a tragedy, and a tragicomedy are entirely new.

One point in Valeri's argument that the Corsini manuscript is derived from the Casanatense is that there is stamped on the covers the cardinal's hat which Maurice of Savoy assumed in 1621 and relinquished in 1642. So much for the covers, but not for their contents which, judging by their crumpled edges and disturbed sequence of numbers, represent a rearrangement of old materials. I have come by no external evidence for the date of the Corsini collection, but it seems unjustifiable to regard it as certainly later than 1621 when its claims for priority can be balanced so evenly with the Casanatense miscellany. Locatelli found the originals of his scenari in a wretched condition, and this decay implies an early acting date. It is likely that the Corsini scenari were written up from the same plays and scraps and adapted to the needs of a different company.

While Locatelli purveys for the 'Accademici' the Corsini scribe may represent the 'Comici'. The fact that where scenari in other miscellanies correspond to scenari common to the Casanatense and Corsini collections, they tend to follow the Corsini version suggests that the collection is probably in the direct theatrical tradition, and Locatelli's on an academic side-track.<sup>1</sup> At least it is certain that every now and then the Corsini manuscript can throw light on the Casanatense plays by recording details which Locatelli took for granted.

*Second Casanatense Collection: Codex 4186.* A note that 'Il

<sup>1</sup> 'La Schiava' Cors. I. 2; Loc. I. 28 'Le due Schiave'; Naples I. 15 'Emilia; Il Granchio' Cors. II. 30; Loc. I. 46; Naples I. 12.

## 12 *The Bibliography of the Commedia dell' Arte*

Medico di suo honore' was played for the first time in Florence on 17 October 1642 gives us a limit for the compilation of the collection of forty-eight plots in Codex 4186 of the Casanatense, first noticed by F. de Simone Brouwer in 1901.<sup>1</sup> Substantially it is the work of one copyist, but a few additions and corrections have been made by another hand. Each scenario is folded to itself, and when unsewn may have been in actual use by the comedians.

A further heading to the first scenario, 'opera tratta dallo spagnuolo' is typical of this miscellany. In all but ten plays the comic masks are completely subordinate to the complicated excitements of intrigues which bring on to the Italian stage the names, manners, ideals, and dramatic conventions of Spain in the seventeenth century. Twelve of these scenari can be referred to their literary sources, and the others show the Spanish influence so strongly that we cannot but suspect from their style and titles that they derive from plays or translations which are no longer accessible to us.<sup>2</sup> Some of the lists of *dramatis personae* in this manuscript are particularly interesting. Alongside the characters proper to the play are written the stage names of their impersonators, so that for seven scenari we can reconstruct the cast of speaking parts and identify the players of the more distinctive masks.

### *Other Manuscript Collections*

*In the Museo Correr, Venice.* Codex 1040 of the Museo Correr in Venice containing fifty-one scenari is assigned on the evidence of handwriting to the first half of the seventeenth century. V. Rossi, who found and described it in 1896, suggested some connexion with the title-lists of the Scala, Locatelli, and Corsini Collections, and made a searching comparison between the scenari *L'Astrologo* and *La Trappolaria* and the homony-

<sup>1</sup> *Rendiconti della R. Acc. de' Lincei*, Serie V, vol. x, p. 391.

<sup>2</sup> See W. Smith, *Mod. Philology*, xv. 3 and *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc. of America*, xxxix, p. 147.

mous comedies of Della Porta.<sup>1</sup> The scenario of *Li Suppositi* which follows Ariosto very closely, Rossi had already published without comment 'per nozze Flamini-Fanelli' 1895. It is impossible to say whether the situations of jealous misunderstanding brought about by misdelivered letters and eaves-dropping lovers which are persistent to the point of monotony represent a collector's taste or a company's repertory. To Rossi's source plays we may add *Li Due Amanti Furiosi* which is Della Porta's *La Furiosa*, *Li due Sorelle Rivale* from Luchetti's comedy, and *Oratio Inavertito* from *L'Incauto* of Nicolò Barbieri. Three scenari go back to Scala, three to Locatelli, seven reappear in the Naples miscellany.

*The Magliabechian Manuscript.* Modern studies of the Commedia dell'arte begin with the twenty-two plots reprinted in *Scenari inediti* in 1880. It is odd that Adolfo Bartoli should assign them to the eighteenth century when the Magliabechian manuscript (Codex, II. i. 90) in which they are found is described as:

'Commedie xxii all' improvviso, o spartiti per le medesime  
cod. chart, in fol. Saec. XVII.'

Another copy (Codex F. Riccardiana 2800) in the Laurentian Library noticed by Guilio Caprin also belongs to the seventeenth century.<sup>2</sup>

Whoever collected these plots made a somewhat unsuccessful attempt to give the authors their due. *Le Tre Gravide* is ascribed to Fr. Ricciolini, *Il Cavaliere Perseguitato* and *La Spada Fatale* to Bricci. I can find no trace of the first two plays,

<sup>1</sup> *Rendiconti della R. Ist. Lombardo*, Serie II, vol. XXIX, p. 883.

<sup>2</sup> *Rivista Teatrale Italiana*, vol. IX, p. 53, 1905. There are a few points of difference between these manuscripts in the attribution of the plays: the most interesting is the entry 'del Bricci' after 'Il Cavaliere perseguitato' the Riccardi MS.

but as I shall show later the third has been confused with *La Spada Mortale* of Verucci.

*Vatican Manuscript.* A manuscript in the Vatican Library has hitherto received no attention beyond a notice by Valeri. As item 6, occupying sheets 127-183 of the Codex Barb. Lat. 3895, there are nine scenari headed, 'Selva di nuove comedie'. Ten different hands may be distinguished, all, however, characteristic of the seventeenth century. From the Spanish style of the intrigues they might be allotted to the second period. In spite of this variety the scenari take the standing of a collection from the system of names and from the remarkable use of the form 'azzi' or 'azi' for the technical 'lazzi' throughout. As the last six are numbered ix to xiv, it is probable that we have only part of a larger miscellany.

*Neapolitan Collection.* Through the generosity of Benedetto Croce the most substantial collection of 183 scenari is now Codex XI. AA. 40, 41 in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele at Naples.<sup>1</sup> The first volume is sound; the second has suffered from fire, and in spite of careful repair two scenari are defective and seven others difficult to decipher. The collection was made in 1700 by D. Anibale Sersale, Conte di Casamarciano as his 'Gibaldone de Soggetti da recitarsi all'impronto. Alcuni proprii, e gl'altri da diversi'. All but the last four in the first volume were copied for him by a player Antonio Passanti detto Oratio il Calabrese. There appear to have been three other copyists.

As the title-page hints, here is new and old material. Thirty-eight scenari are variants of plots that we have met with in earlier collections; six more reappear in the Perugian miscellany, and *La Maggior Gloria* was acted in Modena during the seventeenth century. Seventeen I have been able to trace to their sources in Spanish drama, and ten more derive from Italian printed plays.

<sup>1</sup> See B. Croce, *Giornale Storico*, xxix, p. 211 and C. Levi, *Rivista Teatrale It.*, Anno X, vol. xviii, pp. 14; 257 and Anno XI, vol. xvi, pp. 1; 257.

*Biancolelli's notes in Paris.* An eighteenth-century manuscript in the Bibliothèque de l'Opera and a copy in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Fonds Français, Collection de Soleinne 9328) contain Gueullette's translation of the memoranda of Domenico Biancolelli for his part as Arlecchino in 73 extempore plays. The originals are lost and the notes never took the recognized scenario form but in many cases the action is indicated sufficiently to establish the connexions with scenari current in Italy and in Paris before and after his zenith between 1661-8.

*Miscellany of D. Placido Adriano in Perugia.*

To stray a little beyond my period for the sake of completeness, I should like to describe a miscellany in the Biblioteca Comunale of Perugia (Codex A. 20), compiled in 1734 by D. Placido Adriano, of Lucca, Priest.<sup>1</sup> The large quarto manuscript of 800 pages is mercifully provided with an index to guide us through its picturesque jumble of plots, lazzi, chiuette, songs, sonnets, echo concetti, prologues, salutations, soliloquies, tirades, dialogues, riddles, and musical and comic intermezzi. Adriano's calling apparently did not interfere with his hobby. Another manuscript (D. 46) contains four of his plays, two in Neapolitan, and two 'conveyed' from the Spanish; he planned to write others, but especially he loved to manage a group of amateurs in impromptu recitation.

'I have made this miscellany,' he says in the preface, 'because I have proved by my own experience that even the finest extempore actors having fifteen or twenty different parts on hand may lack suitable words, and often will merely repeat themselves; and again because those who take the part of lovers and ladies are not always ready for their dialogues of love and disdain and so forth. Therefore I have collected all kinds, so that each may have cloth for his coat.'

His twenty-two scenari appear to be records of performances

<sup>1</sup> B. Croce, *Giornale Storico*, xxxi, p. 458, 1898.

16 *The Bibliography of the Commedia dell' Arte*

which he had staged for his friends and patrons, sometimes playing the part of a Pulcinella himself. Some of the titles betray the fact that he did not despise old material. Nine we have met with before in the other collections; *La Tabernaria* is taken from Della Porta's comedy; *Le Furbarie di Coricillo* is said to be by Sig. D. Plicardo Daniria di Velac, a patent anagram for D. Placido Adriano di Lucca, a process which he evidently applied to the plot for it is merely *La Trappolaria* decked out with a few fresh 'lazzi'.

For stagecraft this is the most instructive miscellany that we have. The 'lazzi' are numbered and expounded as a special item; it is suggested what riddles and salutations should be used; ticklish passages of dialogue at cross-purposes are provided verbatim; the actor who is doubling the parts of lover and magician is warned of the best moment to retire to change his make-up.

*Scenari in Leningrad.* There exists in the Bibliothèque de l'Académie des Sciences, at Leningrad, a unique printed copy of a Russian translation of thirty-nine 'scenari' (thirty comedies, one tragedy, and eight 'intermedie') made in 1733-5, probably by V. Trédiakovsky. I have not yet succeeded in obtaining the edition of the Russian text prepared by V. Peretz in 1917 which is quoted in the third edition of C. Miclachevsky's *Commedia dell' arte*, 1927, p. 96.

*Scenari in Modena.* The handful of scenari found by Emilio Re among a pile of theatrical documents (Busta. V) in the Archivio di Stato at Modena can hardly be called a collection, but they may be taken together as a group before turning to the single scenari.<sup>1</sup> Four are connected with plots in the Naples miscellany; three others are marked with the Estense

<sup>1</sup> *Giornale Storico*, lv, p. 325, 1910. See also Paglicci-Brozzi, *Rivista Teatrale Italiana*, Anno VIII, vol. xiii, fasc. 2, for a reprint of *Le bizzarre d' Argentina cavaliere e gentildonna*, 1908, *Ippolito e Boffetto creduti Turchi con Zaccagnino amante disperato*, 1643.

eagle and written in a hand judged to be of the early seventeenth century. A synopsis of *Gl'Inganni dell'Inimicizia con le multiplicate stravaganze de matrimoni* given in narrative form but headed 'Comiche' seems to have escaped Re's notice.

*Miscellaneous Single Scenari and Titles extant*

Of the single scenari the earliest are probably the two also found by Re in the Biblioteca Estense (*Misc.* i. 740) which are judged to belong to the sixteenth century. The details of the last dozen I consign to a footnote.<sup>1</sup> Extracts and notices for new or kindred scenari which help us to trace the career of

<sup>1</sup> 1. *Flaminio Desperato* prefixed by a Prologue by A. Soldano, dated 1610. See Martucci, *Nuova Antologia*, iii. 1885.

2. *Li Sdegni Amorosi*, 1615. See Mazzatinti, *Biblioteche di Francia*, iii. 179.

3. *Gl'Amici Infidi*, 1632. A. Bartoli, op. cit., p. lix, n. 4.

4. 'Scenario della Tragicomedia *Del Principe Sidonio*' . . . 1654. Vatican. Codex Barb. Lat. 3737. If it were not that the main incidents of the plot recur in one of the Neapolitan scenari 'L'Amore tra Nemici' it would hardly be justifiable to claim this elegant little vellum manuscript for the popular comedy. The Neapolitan title is misleading since the play has no connexion with Cicognini's 'Amore tra Nemici' though there is a trace of the same situation in his 'Principe Giardinero'.

5. Two printed copies of *D. Chiscotto della Mancia*, Commedia da recitarsi nel Seminario Romano nelle Corrente Vacanze del Carnevale 1692, da Sig. Convittori delle Camere Mezzane' in the Casanatense Miscellanies in Folio (152 and 172) correspond to the Viennese manuscript of *Un pazzo guarisce l'altro* reprinted by Maddalena in *Sitzungsberichte der K. Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosoph. hist. Classe*, vol. cxliii, 1900.

6. *Diarbech*, 1692, Casanatense, *Misc.* Fol. 152(2) and 172(1).

7. *Plauto alla moderna*, 1693. Cas. *Misc.* Fol. 172(3).

8. *La Trappolaria*, A. Perrucci, *L'Arte Rappresentativa*, 1699, Pt. II.

9-10. Codex 976 (XVIIth century) in the Biblioteca della R. Acc. de' Lincei in the Palazzo Corsini contains two untitled scenari. See F. de Simone Brouwer, *Rendiconti dell'Acc. de' Lincei*, Serie V, vol. x, 11-12, 1901.

11. Another untitled scenario from Codex *Misc.* 998-2546 (Racc. Cicogna) Museo Correr is reprinted by L. Stoppato in *La Commedia popolare Italiana*.

12. An undated narrative synopsis of a comedy, *Le Gemelle* in a Vatican Codex Ott. 2418, pt. 2, is classed as a scenario by Valeri. It reads more like an elaborate résumé of a typical 'commedia erudita'.



## 18 *The Bibliography of the Commedia dell' Arte*

comic themes are to be found in the rare *Histoire de l'ancien Théâtre Italien* by the brothers Parfaict. The lists of Riccoboni's *Histoire du Théâtre Italien*, 1727, the *Dictionnaire des théâtres de Paris*, the *Mercure Galant*, and in a manuscript catalogue in the Biblioteca Estense give us the titles of many more. While it might be fascinating to explore these subsidiary resources we hardly regret that the noble 600 are only a remnant; on the contrary, it is a relief to be able to reduce them by nearly 200 in discounting variants.

### *Means of dating the Scenari*

The date of a miscellany gives us only a date *ad quem*. These variants show that some of the scenari popular in 1700 had been in acting currency for nearly a century, while a study of sources proves that others in the same collection are derived from plays printed less than fifty years before. As it is incorporated into a miscellany the individual features of a scenario are often blurred. Those few distinctive lists of alternative characters in the second Casanatense manuscript are tantalizingly personal; if we had more like them we might hope to trace a particular company and reconstruct its repertory. Although certain masks prevail in each collection they appear not as the record of individual impersonators but as the reflection of the taste of a collector. We can only make the simplest division and class the miscellanies as pre- or post-Pulcinella. Even this is none too secure a distinction, for Pulcinella was in existence by 1620, and is frequently substituted for Zanni in the revivals of old scenari.

Riccoboni was among the first to recognize two periods in the development of the Commedia dell' arte and made 1620, when the imitation of Spanish drama set in, the point of division. The traffic in plots between the miscellanies makes it impossible to observe this turning-point exactly but a study of sources



Italian and Spanish gives a very fair idea of the changing style. The only satisfactory means of dating, however, is to work back through the variants among scenari and printed plays to determine the limits of a period of acting currency. This process is often held up by the bibliographical problems of the academic-popular plays to which I shall turn in a moment.

*Miscellanies of Speeches*

The miscellanies of scenari were in charge of the Capocomico, but the other actors each made or inherited a commonplace book of speeches and jokes appropriate to the masks which they chose to assume. Proportionately fewer of these survive, but they are more tedious reading than the plots and less suited for publication. The printed examples have generally undergone some selective and polishing process.

In 1699 in the second part of the *Arte Rappresentativa* Perrucci takes his pick of the various collections to provide specimens of the chief types of soliloquy and dialogue fitted for the emergencies of a complete repertory. He constituted himself a general purveyor for improvising actors and boasts that his love dialogues have gone the round of Italian companies and become public property, so that the players claim them as their own invention even to his face.

*The Old Men.* One need only compare the 'consigli' and 'maledizioni' here provided for Pantalone, and the 'tirate' that Adriano writes out for Doctor Gratiano with the representative prologues given by Domenico Bruni in the *Fatiche Comiche* (1623), with the prologue of Aniello Soldano as Dr. Spaccastrummolo,<sup>1</sup> with the *Lettere Chiribizzose* (1587) of Belando, or with the speeches in Rossi's *Fiammella* (1584), all the production of professionals, to realize how completely the amateurs had grasped the stage convention. Whoever wishes can make himself even more familiar with the Doctor's

<sup>1</sup> Rasi, op. cit., i. 165.

'spropositi' from the letters in the Florentine archives from the Graciano of the 'Gelosi',<sup>1</sup> or from the *Cento e Quindici Conclusioni* of Lodovico de Bianchi.<sup>2</sup>

*Captains.* With the Captains the connexion between the spoken and printed 'bravura' is amply testified by Belando, who protests that the Basilisco in his *Amorosi Inganni* is not plagiarizing from the Spanish *Rodomontados* published in 1607, for although some of the boastings are the same the comedy printed in 1609 had been begun in 1593. Belief in Belando's originality explains other parallels between the *Rodomontados* and actor's publications. The compiler of this popular collection drew upon the Conceits of Capitano Spavento as well as upon the Mattamoros, Crocodillo, and Rajabroqueles who figure in the title-page. The little duodecimo volumes were reissued, revised, augmented, and translated into three languages<sup>3</sup> but they hardly rank with the handsome quarto of Francesco Andreini's *Bravure* which appeared in the same year and fixed the type of the Captain for the first period of the *Commedia dell' arte*.

*The Lovers.* The parts of the lovers put the improvising comedians to the greatest strain. Cecchini advises that they should be continually reading good literature and committing to memory fine passages. Barbieri in *La Supplica* (1634) praises his companions for their energy in 'deflowering books'. 'Many provide themselves with translated discourses from other languages; others invent, imitate, and amplify, but it is enough to say that all study, as one can see by their printed work

<sup>1</sup> Arch. Medici, F<sup>a</sup>. 717, c. 352; F<sup>a</sup>. 788, c. 321; F<sup>a</sup>. 808, c. 369; F<sup>a</sup>. 809, c. 579.

<sup>2</sup> Rasi, op. cit., i, p. 406.

<sup>3</sup> 'Rodomuntados Castellanos, recopilados de los comentarios de los muy asparentos, terribles et invincibles capitanes, Metamoros, Crocodillo y Raja broqueles,' 1607. Reprinted 1619; augmented 1626; Italian translation added to the French and Spanish 1627; Englished 1630 and again 1672; 1643 (see Croce, *Ricerche Ispano-Italiane*, p. 24 n.); 1644; 1650.

'in Rhymes, Discourses, Comedies, Soggetti, Prologues, Dialogues, Tragedies, Pastorals and other such.'

'Tis a truth we can bear them witness, as we wade through the formal *Lettere* of Isabella Andreini, the moral treatises of her son, the devotional and elegaic verses of her companions and the other dull literary impositions in which the lovers exercised themselves. But the children of this generation, knowing well that this was an impossible ideal, laid up for themselves dialogues and soliloquies for every possible occasion. There is a manuscript in the Milanese Archives containing *Dialoghi Scenici* by Bruni, the Fulvio of the second 'Confidenti', composed for his companions Flaminia, Delia, Valeria, Lavinia, and Celia, by request. He rose to fifty-one, and this is the first part only. I have not yet been able to examine this collection which was lent by Dr. Paglicci-Brozzi to Luigi Rasi and described in the *Comici Italiani* (i, p. 519). A commonplace book of another variety is in the possession of Senator Croce who generously allowed me to transcribe it while I was in Naples. It evidently belonged to the actor who took the part of the lover in the *Pazzia di Flaminio* in 1680. He allowed himself a choice of soliloquies and entrance speeches to suit the various moods of boldness, fearfulness, and the state of being tongue-tied. There are three series of ejaculations suitable for a first arrival in a strange city, and four for the stages of an elopement. For the favourite scene of madness, for which Perrucci had made but scanty provision, we have pages of frenzied rhetorical questions, ravings composed of snatches of song and mythology, like those given to Isabella in Scala's scenario, culminating in a long scene in which the distracted lover mistakes Policinella for Charon and dices with him with wild innuendo.

The only other example of a commonplace book in the state that it was actually used by the professional is the translation of Biancolelli's notes which I have described in connexion with the scenari. There we have the joke, the lazzo and the anecdote

fitted to the occasion, and hints of the parody which was the chief part of the role of an Arlecchino.

*The Zanni.* Of all the masks, the servants had least part in the miscellanies for they depended most upon action, mimicry, and extempore repartee. The 'lazzi' belong to them and particular Zanni such as Arlecchino, Scappino<sup>1</sup> and Pulcinella leave samples of their verbal wit in rhymes, letters, and facetious pamphlets.

Among the earliest traces of the Italian Arlecchino are the rhymes about his descent into Hell, which were apparently recited on the stage before they were printed in Paris in 1585.<sup>2</sup> Fifteen years later we find the undoubted Arlecchinesque of Martinelli in the *Compositions de Rhétorique* dedicated to 'M. Henry de Bourbon, premier bourgeois de Paris', with its polyglot rhymes, its precious illustrations, and the characteristic impertinence of its fifty-six blank pages.<sup>3</sup> If Martinelli's style is conspicuous by its absence in print it comes full and free in his letters to Maria de' Medici and to the Dukes of Mantua and Florence, whom he addressed jovially as Gossip and Coz and besieges for wine, money, and godmotherly favours.<sup>4</sup>

From the repertory of speeches, songs, 'intermezzi', and duets provided by Perrucci and Adriano it is evident that Pulcinella was free to use any of the 'spropositi' tirades and animal noises collected for the Doctor, the dialogues with echo proper to the Arcadian buffoons and the peculiar type of assonance pun in which Pantalone indulges in *La Fiammella*.

Pulcinella was hardly more important than Arlecchino in his

<sup>1</sup> *Infermità Testamento, e Morte di Francesco Gabrieli Detto Scapino . . .*, 1638. Reprinted by S. Ferrari, *Propugnatore*, Bologna, 1880, Anno XIII, Disp. 1, 2, p. 446.

<sup>2</sup> Bib. Nationale, Paris. Inv. réserve, Ye. 4, 151.

<sup>3</sup> Bib. Nationale, Ye. 1343. See Rasi, op. cit., ii, p. 97 and A. Beijer, *Recueil de plusieurs fragments des premières comédies italiennes*. Published by Duchartre and van Buggenhoudt, Paris, 1928.

<sup>4</sup> Jarro, *L'Epistolario d' Arlecchino*, 1896.

day, but he left a greater mark in literature. His dialect attracted parodists, and as a favourite character he is often chosen to deliver the Prologue in Neapolitan. According to Perrucci, the part consisted in witty blunders and transformations; his ample specimens and those given by Adriano tally with the fragments remaining in plays, scenari, and burlesque poems.

In dealing with the speech miscellanies I have deliberately put on one side the rhymes and letters, broadsides, and burlesques issued by G. C. Croce, Veraldo, Cortese, Bocchini, and others in the names of Pantalone, Gratiano, and the Zanni, and confined myself to what can be shown to be definitely connected with the stage.

*Printed Plays belonging to the Commedia dell'Arte*

The collections of scenari and the commonplace books stand to each other as warp and woof of the *Commedia dell'arte*. For sample weavings, we have a few actor's plays written up after the performance. The player in whose name they are printed should only be regarded as part author. He shares the responsibility with the other members of the company who had helped him to elaborate what may have been his plot, or had supported him in his star performance. The titles of these plays appear in any history of the improvised comedy, but their contents are less well known than they deserve. They are as truly documents of the *Commedia dell'arte* as the miscellanies and help us to determine the value that is to be allowed to the semi-popular academic plays which hitherto have been almost entirely neglected.

There needs a little discrimination, however, before we avail ourselves of this material, and I have made a tentative classification into three groups. In the first I have put plays which correspond in every way to the type of plays printed by the actors. Presented as anonymous comedies they might be taken

for expanded scenari. In the second group are those in which the popular element is in abeyance to an attempt at originality. To the third I consign the plays into which Pulcinella and Arlecchino intrude as servants, Pantalone and Gratiano as counsellors, or as fathers in a comic subplot only. With one exception, I shall confine myself to a description of the first group.

*General Correspondence between Plays and Miscellanies*

Any study of the plots in the miscellanies soon reveals the permutations and combinations by which innumerable scenari might be constructed. The skeleton of each of these plays is simply another reshuffling of the *Commedia dell' arte* plot material. There is hardly a theme, a situation, a device that might not be paralleled from among the scenari. The very 'lazzi' are no better and no worse than those recommended by Locatelli and expounded by Adriano: sometimes they are identical. The masks have commandeered the whole cast, and where their dialects are not reproduced in print the author assures us that the omission was made for the convenience of the reader, and in the trust that the actors will know better than he how the parts should be given on the stage. Whenever the dialogue is not immediately concerned with the conduct of the plot, the speeches are developed along the lines laid down in the miscellanies. Although some of the jokes are actually the same, I do not wish to give the impression that the dramatists lifted their speeches from the miscellanies, but simply that they found the labour of composition considerably lightened by the use of the stencils which had been cut by generations of players and laid up in the commonplace books.

*Common Plots: Verucci and Locatelli*

In some cases, however, a plot corresponds point for point with one of the scenari so that we are at a loss to know which may have come first. The wide range of acting currency of the

scenari, and for the plays undated issues and the possibility of earlier lost editions continually hold us up.<sup>1</sup> The most remarkable case is the correspondence between five of the Locatelli scenari and five of the twelve plays printed by Virgilio Verucci, of whom we know no more than that he was Romano, Dottore di Legge, e detto l'Universale nell' Accademia dell' Intrigati.

In three cases the scenario has precedence. The play of *La Moglie Superba* of which the earliest known edition belongs to 1621, corresponds to the scenario of *Li Porci*, number 42 in Locatelli's 1618 volume. *Pulcinella, amante di Colombina*, 1628 attributed to Verucci in the 'Apes Urbanae' (1633) is preceded by Locatelli's *Fantasma* (i. 19), and Verucci's *La Schiava* (1629) by the scenario of *Le due schiave* (i. 28).

Against these we have the undisputed priority of Verucci with the *Dispettoso Marito* 1612 in comparison with *L'Innocente Rivenuta* (Loc. i. 4), and the problem of *La Spada Fatale*. There are two scenari in Locatelli's second volume matching this play, and the other *La Cometa* (ii. 40), a plain tragedy, one *Il Serpe Fatale* (ii. 39) in a pastoral setting. The earliest edition of the play which I have been able to examine is for 1627, but Allacci quotes two earlier issues both by Discepolo of Viterbo 1618 and 1620. The Prologue in 1627 refers to the play as the author's eighth 'operetta comica' and observes that it is more than ten years since he began to

<sup>1</sup> *Il Dottor Bacceton*, of Dottor Bonvicin Gioanelli (Venetia undated) appears in scenario form in (1) MS. Magliabechiano. See A. Bartoli, op. cit. (2) MS. AA. xi. 41, Naples, vol. ii. 72. See also Bibliographical note under 'Pantalone Imbertonaio'.

*Il Finto Principe*, Don Carlo Ambrosi, Bologna, undated, and according to Allacci in Venezia 1729. For a discussion of the place of this play among the scenari of the 'Finto Principe' tradition see *Mod. Lang. Review*, xxiii, p. 48.

*L'Inimicizia tra i due Vecchi con il finto Indovino*, Fr. Lachi, dal Borgo alla Collina in Casentino, Quadrio, quotes an edition for G. Monti, Bologna, 1667. Copy examined Bologna 1684. Corresponding scenario, *L'Inimicizia*, Locatelli Miscellany, i. 49.



publish. Counting back from 1627 this is meaningless; Verucci's first comedy appeared in 1609. The Prologue evidently belongs to one of the earlier editions. If either should turn up Verucci's priority would be established, since the corresponding scenari belong to the 1622 volume.

Numerically the odds are still with Locatelli, but other considerations adjust the balance. For two out of the three plots in which the play came out later than the scenario there is the alternative of a common source. So that when the prologue to an undated issue of *La Schiava* (of which the first known edition is 1629) declares that the author had drawn upon the Latin play which afforded *Emilia*—that is upon the *Épidicus* from which Groto had taken his plot—we are bound to give him the benefit of the doubt before we insist that he built up his play from the scenario. So with *Pulcinella, amante di Colombina* (1628) and Locatelli's *Fantasma*, ultimately both depend upon the *Mostellaria*. As will appear later, there are other reasons as well as the details of correspondence which make it most unlikely that the plays and scenari were produced independently; but for the time being the possibility must be admitted.

The two tragi-comedies are of a different type. The story of the *Dispettoso Marito* can be traced to the *Decameron* (II. ix): we are told in the prologue that the tragic theme of the *Spada Fatale* is drawn from the 'Avvenimenti d'Erasto' and other romances. These books were also at Locatelli's disposal, but the defence of independent dramatization entails a double coincidence only less remarkable than the birth of the four twins of Syracuse. We can get no further if we insist upon deciding between Verucci or Locatelli in the matter of invention.

Once again in the Prologue to the *Spada Fatale* there is a clue. Here it is admitted that beyond the sources in the romances 'perhaps there may be too some part of the comic 'business—'qualche burla, ò di parte di essa'—that will have



'appeared in the improvised comedy, since nowadays there is 'nothing that someone or other has not said already'. The defence goes on, 'if this author has borrowed he has also lent' during the ten years since he began to publish. From this we gather that Verucci would not have claimed exclusive originality. A more tenable theory would be that he and Locatelli shared the responsibility for each play and worked together as companion amateurs in the same academy. In the prologue to *Li Stroppiati* Verucci remarks that his comedies were written as a pastime while he diverted himself with various compositions among other young 'virtuosi' in the Accademia of the *Intrigati* which he had founded himself in 1606.

It is not known to what academy Locatelli belonged. Valeri suggests the 'Umoristi' because his friend Buzzi was a member. I should now prefer the 'Intrigati'. But whether they were companions or rivals, how is it that they as 'virtuosi academici' should be concerned with the commedia improvvisa, which is generally regarded as the comedy of the profession? For lack of information in their particular case we must make another general comparison.

#### *Improvised Comedy by Amateurs*

*Salvator Rosa*. It was not only in Spanish Tragedies or as Spanish Gipsies that gentlemen tried to imitate the methods of the quick comedians. The practice of playing extempore was one of the recognized diversions of the members of Italian academies in the seventeenth century. Sound instances are provided by the Pisan youths who played *all' improvviso* after the manner of the *Zanni* before the Grand Duke of Tuscany,<sup>1</sup> by the 'Incostanti' of Cicognini, by the friends of Adriano of Lucca and of Salvator Rosa. Rosa made improvised acting his hobby as a means of self-advertisement when obscurity in

<sup>1</sup> A. Solerti, *Musica e balla alla Corte de' Medici*. See also Ademollo, *I Teatri di Roma nel sec. xvii*, p. 35, and A. Petraccone, *La Commedia dell' arte*, 1927, p. 71.



1. *Pantalone Imbertonao*, 1617 (Prologo).

***Pantalone . Gratiano . Tiburtio .***



2. *Ibid.* II. i.

**Tiburtio con un Cestaroio carico di robba da  
mangiare. Zanni.**



3. *Pantalone Imbertonao*, 1617, III. i.

**Gratiano . Couiello.**



4. *Ibid.* III. ii.

*Mago, Miriillo, e Ciufalone.*



5. *La Rosmira*, 1676, 1. ii.



6. *Ibid.* 1. ii (Ombra).

*Ciufalone, Tamarici, e Pelliccia.*



7. *La Rosmira*, 1676, III. vi.

*Antismodèo Demonio nel habito de Tamarici  
Ciufalone, e Pelliccia.*



8. *Ibid.* III. viii.

Rome began to be irksome. He began by masquerading as a charlatan all through the Carnival of 1639 playing a Coviello called Formica. He was so successful that in the summer he went on to give comedies just outside the Piazza del Popolo : and later in Florence he joined an academy which had pledged themselves to the public performance of comedies all' improvviso to be held annually in the palazzo, but for the public.<sup>1</sup> Baldinucci, a contemporary, describes these plays as 'soggetti nobili e gravi, senza l'aggiunta di parti ridicoli', but among the masks that he notes were Dr. Viviani's Pasquella, Rosa's Pascariello and the Dottore Gratiano of Francesco Maria Agli, an old merchant of sixty, who for years would come specially from Bologna to Florence, leaving his business for months on end simply to act with Salvator, with whom he would make scenes over which the laughter of the audience was so violent that it was pronounced physically dangerous. Rosa's masks were evidently modifications of the stage Neapolitans. He borrowed from the Commedia dell'arte to enrich it by variation. The development of Pulcinella was due to a like contamination.

*Giovanni Bricci* (1581-1646). Another painter who diverted himself with acting extempore was Giovanni Bricci, 'detto il Circonspetto nella Congrega de' Taciturni', the son of a Roman mattress-maker and the contemporary of Verucci.<sup>2</sup> Nine of his plays, six pamphlets, and two miscellaneous works were published during his lifetime, and Allacci gives the titles of ten plays left in manuscript. Two were published by his son, Basilio, in 1676 and 1677, and a popular romance *La Flavia* appears in several undated chapbooks. Bricci had a real flair for improvised acting and imparts a vivacity to the stalest material. There is a spark of originality in the controlling ideas

<sup>1</sup> B. de Dominici, *Vite de' Pittori, Scultori, ed Architetti Napolitani*, 1763, T. iii, pp. 222, 232.

<sup>2</sup> See J. N. Erythraeus, *Pinacotheca*. 1692, III. xxxvii ; and Mandosio, 'Bib. Romana'.

of the *Difettosi* (1605), the *Tartaruca* (1677) and in the pastoral and eclogue, which substantiates the prologue to *La Tartarea*, *Commedia Infernale* (1614), in which he hopes that his plays may be found a little out of the ordinary run. Actually Bricci's originality would put his plays into the second category but there is a double excuse for making room for them here. Writing for amateurs he gave particularly full instructions and even illustrated his plays with tiny cuts showing the dress and scenery. Those in *Pantalone Imbertonao* (1617) are particularly valuable in showing the contrivance of hangings round three sides of a rectangular stage. The curtains were painted to represent houses, but it is plain from the picture that the audience would not be offended if the actor should hold aside the lath and plaster when he was to be observed eavesdropping.

Among improvising amateurs Bricci's name evidently carried some weight, so that either by fraud or ignorance plays were misattributed to him. In the Riccardi MS. two plays are headed 'del Bricci', of the first, *Il Cavaliere Perseguitato*, I can find no trace, but the second, *La Spada Mortale* is of course the *Spada Fatale* of Verucci.

By way of the confusion over this play we come round again to the problem of the relations between Verucci and Locatelli, to find that it becomes less puzzling once we recognize the fashion for improvised acting among the academicians. Relieved of the difficulty of deciding to whom the honour of invention is due, we may turn to the general question of the relationship between the 'academici' and 'comici'.

*Interaction between the Commedia Erudita and the Commedia dell'arte*

Locatelli refers to his 'fragmenti talmente malcondotti': Verucci admits his use of the professionals' comic devices. It is, perhaps, worth noticing that out of the five plots that they share, four reappear in the Corsinian, and three in the Naples

### 34 *The Bibliography of the Commedia dell' Arte*

Miscellany ; while of the *Spada Fatale* there are no less than six versions extant besides references to performance in Paris. If I am right in upholding the independence of the Corsini collection and in classing it as a player's as opposed to an academic repertory, it looks as though these plays were directly in the theatrical tradition and were borrowed originally by the academicians from the professionals to be returned—if one dare transpose a phrase—'cured and perfect in their limbs'.

The imaginary sequence is of a plot taken from a classical or neo-classical comedy for professional improvisation. In course of time this becomes considerably mangled by the intrusion of buffoonery, and roughly written out might well be almost incomprehensible. Restoration is undertaken by the academician with some experience of the methods and jargon of the *commedia dell'arte*. Referring back to the original play he rights the motivization and symmetry of the plot but preserves the elements of burlesque and dialect clowning which came in during the contact with the popular stage. This refurbishing is either expanded into a play or circulated as a manuscript scenario for the advantage of other improvisors both amateur and professional. If there are only a few scenari for which we have sufficient evidence to follow each stage of this sequence, the fragments combine to prove the truth of the generalization.

Although there was always a sharp social distinction there was continual intercourse between amateurs and professionals. Some of the players were elected members of the academies. Isabella Andreini had her medal struck as one of the 'Intenti' of Pavia. That the education of the lovers was sometimes by painful private process we gather from a naïve remark from 'Celia' Malloni of the second 'Confidenti', when the rowdiness of her admirers had lost the company its licence in Lucca. Her practice of receiving gentlemen of the city and allowing gambling at her lodgings was called into question, and she writes to Don Giovanni de' Medici, her patron, 'As I told you,



'both here and in other cities I have been visited by the academicians who are well-read and cultured gentlemen, who, I acknowledge, have helped me to educate myself, for I have no other means of information. Further, I made use of the profit from the raffles now and then either because I found myself embarrassed by debt, or because I judged it necessary and convenient to do so.'<sup>1</sup> Again the traffic in plots was no secret. Perrucci says the soggetti were either made specially for improvisation or taken from old or modern comedies. In the preface to his *Angelica* Fornaris, the Captain Coccodrillo of the first 'Confidenti', explains that this comedy was given him by a Neapolitan gentleman whom he met in Venice a few years ago. It was evidently Della Porta of whose *Olimpia* Fornaris' comedy is a popular rendering. The plot reappears in scenario form in Locatelli's collection, one among at least 15 plots drawn from *Commedie erudite*. In the Venetian Collection 6 are so derived. In the second Casanatense a minimum of 13 and in the Neapolitan of 17 can be traced to Spanish drama. These may suffice to indicate the debt from the *Commedia dell'arte* to the *erudita*.

What the professional comedians borrowed as plots they paid back by providing the academicians with a dramatic material resuscitated into popularity by their methods of improvisation. While the *Commedia dell'arte* could not have existed without the *Commedia erudita*, it is equally true that the life of the *Commedia erudita* was considerably prolonged in the *Commedia dell'arte*. The second stage at which the virtuosi are found imitating the technique of the comici, borrowing back their plots and assuming their masks has just been described, and the reappearance, as improved scenari of plots which have already been expanded and printed by the academicians indicates the cyclical process in which both

<sup>1</sup> Arch. Med. Filza 5141, c. 225. See also A. Neri, *La Scena Illustrata*, 1 August 1886.

36 *The Bibliography of the Commedia dell' Arte*

parties suffer the fate of the hero of Ilkley Moor. We follow out the tradition to see how the processes of literary digestion each gets his 'oan back'.

It is mostly a matter of watching Imperial Caesar turn to clay; but once in a while we can see how the clay turned to Imperial Caesar. Let me take as a last example the tradition of the popular pastoral. Upon the sober ground of motifs and situations from Tasso and Guarini, the professional worked in the gawdy threads of the lewd adventures of Pantalone and Zanni, and gradually collected a set for the pastoral which included an island inhabited by rustic and shepherd lovers, tyrannized by an enchanter with a limited period of power and the shipwreck of a group of strangers—Pantalone and his crew—whose pranks provoke the Magician to revenge himself by spectacular metamorphoses and precipitate the denouement at which he renounces his art, discloses his relationship to the lovers and sometimes consents to leave the island and return to civil life. Of the 19 scenari of this type that are left, the earliest are in Locatelli's miscellany but the reflection in printed drama begins as far back as 1581 to assure us that here we have clay for the *Tempest* and not the *Tempest* turned to clay.<sup>1</sup> How and precisely what happened is another and a longer story, but it is one which depends upon the general assumption of the interaction between the amateurs and the professionals which is illustrated by the plays which have been under consideration.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

As the basis of investigation I have taken the list of plays of the popular-academic tradition made by F. S. Quadrio in 'Della Storia e Ragione d'ogni Poesia' 1744 (vol. v, pp. 226–

<sup>1</sup> *GP Intricati*, Pasqualigo, 1581; *Fiammella*, B. Rossi, 1584; *Gratiana*, Acc. Infiammato, 1588; *I Falsi Dei*, E. Cimilotti, 1599; *I Forestieri*, O. Sorio, 1612; *Diana Vinta*, Confuso Acc. Ordito, 1624.

35) referring for further bibliographical details to L. Allacci, 'Drammaturgia' 1666 and 1755, and Mazzucchelli, 'Scrittori d'Italia' 1753-63.

While there are still a few plays and many editions cited by these authorities that I have not yet been able to trace, the following facts have come my way which may serve to correct and supplement their lists.

(1) *Plays belonging to the popular-academic tradition not mentioned by Quadrio in this connexion*

(a) *Group A.* (See p. 23).

*Il Cieco Finto overo Raguetta Viandante*, A. Bombardieri, Roma, 1658.

*Il Dottor Baccheton*, Bonvicin Gioanelli. See *infra*.

*Escharistumerotos*, overo *I Contenti d' amore*, Carlo Tiberi, Romano. *Il Disprezzato Accademico Nascosto*. Landini, 1639.

*La Fuga dell' Hermana* (See Quadrio, vol. v, p. 104 as 'Erminia'), de Silvestris, 1638.

*Il Terremoto*, Michel' Angelo Mercurij, 1623 (see Quadrio, v, p. 101).

*La Zitella Combattuta*, overo le *Disgratie di Biscottino*, F. G[attici], Viterbo, 1673.

(b) *Plays belonging to Group B.*

*Amore e sdegno di Dottore Gratiano*, ò *il Gratiano Infuriato*, Fuggi l'ozio, Cesare da Budrio. 1679.

*Diana Finta*, Confuso Accademico Ordito. (C. Fiamma.) (Quadrio, v, p. 349.)

*Li Due Anelli Simili*, Brignosale. 1669; 1671. (Quadrio, v, p. 354.)

*I Falsi Dei*, Acc. Estuante, E. Cimilotti. (Quadrio, v, p. 414.)

*Il Finto Marchese*, Bartolommei. 1676.

*Florinda*, Regina di Patusa, M. Cellio. 1629. (Quadrio, v, p. 349.)

*I Forestieri*, O. Sorio. 1612. (Quadrio, v, p. 412.)

*Fortuna de' Pazzi*, F. Nanni. (Quadrio, vii, p. 231.)

*Forza dell' Honore*, Fr. Cittadonio (E. Tazza). 1654. (Quadrio, vii, p. 230.)

*Gratiana*, Acc. Infiammato. (Quadrio, v. 402.)

*L'Insolenze di Pascarello Citrolo*, M. Bosso da Cora. 1635.

*L'Invidia in Corte*, undated.

*La Nascita d' Himeno*, F. Miedel[chini]. 1623. (Quadrio, v, p. 348.)

*Rosalba*, A. Scaramuccia. 1638.

*Scherno di Giove*, A. Bennetti. 1636. (Quadrio, v, p. 103.)

### 38 *The Bibliography of the Commedia dell' Arte*

*Scola di Pulcinelli*, Anon. A Masquerade. 1676.

*La Zingara Fattacchata*, Mascarata. M. Bosso da Cora. 1654 (cp. 'Z. Frustrata'. 1672. Quadrio, v, p. 1061).

#### (2) *Editions earlier than any recorded by Allacci or Quadrio*

*Anima dell' Intrico*, P. Veraldi, 1621. (Allacci, 1623.)

*Ersilia*, V. Verucci. 1611. (Allacci, 1622.)

*Hoggi, corre quest' usanza*, C. Tiberi. 1641. (Allacci, 1665.)

*La Pazzia de due Vecchi Amanti*, N. N. detto Accademico Moschino. 1676. (Allacci, 1683.)

*La Tartarea*, G. Bricci. 1614 and 1674. (Allacci, 1670.)

#### (3) *Duplicate titles*

*Lo Gnaccara*, M. Bossi da Chori. 1665. (Allacci, 1636), published as *La Pedrina* in 1675.

*El Pantalon Burlao*, D. Balbi. Licensed 1673, printed as *Il Lipa* in the fourth edition.

*Pantalon Imbertonao*, G. Bricci. 1617; 1626; issued as *P. Innamorao*, Viterbo, 1619. Allacci notes one edition only (1629) for this alternative title: possibly 1629 is a slip for 1619. The play was reissued by Righettini of Trevigi as 'P. Imbertonao' in 1647/8. Some confusion is caused by two copies in the British Museum (11715. a. 13, and 11715. a. 12). In the first the title-page is bound up by mistake with Gioanelli's 'Dottor Baccheton' of which there is an undated issue from Venice in the Bib. Vittorio Emanuele.

*Pelliccia*, Servo Sciocco, overo *la Rosmira*. G. Bricci. 1676. Wrongly entered by Allacci as 'Rosminda'; possibly to be identified with 'Lo Scaramuccia' noted by Quadrio as one of the six comedies left in MS. among Bricci's papers.

*La Portia*, V. Verucci, published as *Le Matrimonio per accidente*. Bologna, 1666. (See Bib. Casanatense.)

Editions for 1611 and 1621 (Venetia) are unrecorded.

## THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY

### REPORT AND ANNUAL MEETING

The Annual Meeting of the Society for the reception of the Council's Report and the Balance Sheet and for the Election of Officers and Members of Council was held at the Rooms of the British Academy, Burlington Gardens, on Monday, 17 March, after the conclusion of the Monthly Meeting, about 6 p.m.

Previous to the Meeting the following Report from the Council and the Balance Sheet were sent out to all Members of the Society.

### ANNUAL REPORT



**D**URING the past year the Bibliographical Society has moved from 20 Hanover Square where its inaugural meetings were held in 1892 and which had been its home ever since. Our new quarters are at the Rooms of the British Academy, themselves part of the imposing building mainly occupied by the Civil Service Commission. The Society's library has also been removed, from University College, and is now housed in the book-room of the British Academy, where books can be taken out before any Meeting of the Society, or can be obtained, when not too heavy, through the post by writing for them to the Librarian of the Bibliographical Society, c/o The British Academy, Burlington Gardens. It is hoped that arrangements will shortly be made by which members can obtain books by calling for them personally at other times than before Meetings. The question is also being considered as to whether a new list of the Society's books should be printed at once, or whether an effort should first be made to fill some of the more obvious gaps.

The membership of the Society continues to increase despite the annual losses by death. In the past year these include two of our English honorary members, Cardinal Gasquet and Sir E. Maunde Thompson, both too well known to need any eulogy here, and also two much valued members of Council, Sir Lionel Cust and Mr. J. P. Gilson, the latter a distinguished palaeographer whose premature death is a great loss to all students of his subject as well as to the frequenters of the Department of Manuscripts at the British Museum of which he was Keeper. We have also to regret the deaths of Sir H. George Fordham, a great authority on maps and road-books, and Sir Geoffrey Butler.

In addition to *The Library* members have received one special publication during the past year, Mr. A. F. Johnson's *German Ornamental Borders*. It had been hoped that three other volumes would have been distributed in 1929 to make up arrears; but Lt.-Col. Isaac's *English Printing Types, 1501-35*, has been delayed by its enlargement, at the request of the Council, to include Scottish printing as well as English, and Dr. Greg has given the *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company, 1576-1602*, a much more detailed index and longer introduction than was at first contemplated. Mr. Pollard, again, has been hindered from completing Mr. H. R. Plomer's *Dictionary of English Printers and Publishers 1726-75* by exceptional difficulties in editing *The Library*, for which, despite an appeal in the last Annual Report, there was a serious shortage of copy in the middle of the year, causing the September number to be delayed till far into October. Tapping new sources of supply took much time, but the later numbers of Volume X have all been full ones and Mr. Pollard hopes to signalize the beginning of a fifth decade of *The Library's* career by getting out the June number on the first of the month. Although the existing forty volumes have been divided into four decades, it is not proposed to begin a fifth series with the

forty-first; but a General Index to the ten volumes issued under the Society's auspices will shortly be put in hand.

The Society's balance sheet circulated with this Report shows (in addition to a bank-balance unhealthily swollen by the failure to complete the three books already named) three items new to our accounts: (1) the payment for the legal expenses of the Deed of Trust sanctioned at the last Annual Meeting; (2) the cost (defrayed out of Mr. Bosanquet's donation included in last year's accounts) of the medals for bibliography awarded a year ago; (3) a contribution to the expenses of the Exhibitions held by the First Edition Club to which cards of invitation have been sent to all members of the Society. As the organization of Exhibitions is a primary object of the First Edition Club, while the three separately organized by the Society threw a disproportionate amount of work on the Secretaries, the Council last year sanctioned a first payment, in two instalments, of a contribution of £50 (approximately the cost of each of our Exhibitions) to the expenses incurred by the First Edition Club on condition that the Club's Exhibitions for a year should be open to our members. It is hoped that this arrangement will be approved by the Society and continued.

#### ANNUAL MEETING

THE thirty-seventh Annual Meeting of the Society was held at the rooms of the British Academy, Burlington Gardens, immediately upon the conclusion of the ordinary meeting, the President, Mr. G. F. Barwick, in the Chair.

The minutes of the previous Annual Meeting were read and confirmed.

It was agreed that the Annual Report and Balance Sheet, which had previously been circulated to all members, should be taken as read. Their adoption was then moved from the Chair and carried unanimously.

The President then moved that Dr. Walter Wilson Greg should be elected President of the Society for the ensuing session. This was seconded by Mr. Redgrave and carried unanimously.

Mr. Harold Williams moved that Mr. Stephen Gaselee should be elected a Vice-President of the Society. This was seconded by Mr. Austen-Leigh and carried.

The election of the following as members of the Council for the ensuing session was proposed by Professor A. W. Reed ; namely, Dr. P. S. Allen ; Mr. R. A. Austen-Leigh ; Mr. E. F. Bosanquet ; Dr. E. Marion Cox ; Mr. F. S. Ferguson ; Dr. Geoffrey Keynes ; Mr. J. P. R. Lyell ; Mr. Eric Millar ; Mr. Frank Sidgwick ; Dr. Henry Thomas ; Sir Emery Walker ; Mr. Harold Williams. The motion was seconded by Mr. R. F. Sharp and carried.

The proceedings of the Annual Meeting then terminated.



# BALANCE SHEET

From 1 January to 31 December 1929.

RECEIPTS.			EXPENDITURE		
	£	s. d.		£	s. d.
Balance at Bank 1 January 1929 (£503 8s. 4d.) + £1,500 on Deposit.		2,003 8 4	Printing, Paper, Casing, and Distribution, less proceeds of sales of, and advertisements in, <i>The Library</i>	794	13 4
Entrance Fees		15 14 6	Rent		11 11 0
British Subs., 1929.		645 15 0	Expenses of Meetings		13 1 5
" 1928.		6 6 0	<i>The Library</i> : Editorial Fee		52 10 0
" 1930.		14 14 0	Research		64 10 0
Foreign Subs., 1928 & 1929		44 2 0	Subscription to A.S.L.I.B.		2 2 0
U.S.A. Subs., 1928 & 1929		331 19 0	Payments from Mr. Bosanquet's gift for the Society's medals	42	6 0
Life Members (2)		42 0 0	Expenses of Society's Library		2 2 0
Sale of Publications to Members		134 6 6	Contribution to expenses of First Edition Club's Exhibitions		25 0 0
Interest on Deposit and Investments		74 4 3	Legal Fees		21 0 0
Cheque recredited		2 2 0	Income Tax		7 6 0
			Petty Cash		6 0 0
			Secretarial Expenses		4 4 0
			Cheque returned from Bank		2 2 0
			Bank Charges		10 6
			Balance at Bank, 31 Dec. 1929 (£766 3s. 10d.) + £1,500 on Deposit, less outstanding cheque (10s. 6d.)	2,265	13 4
	£3,314	11 7		£3,314	11 7

R. FARQUHARSON SHARP, *Hon. Treasurer.*

Examined with Vouchers and found correct,

ALEX. NEALE.

A. W. REED.

9 January 1930.

ASSETS.			LIABILITIES.		
	£	s. d.		£	s. d.
£500 2½% Consols @ 54½		271 5 0	Estimated Liability for 32 Life Members	375	0 0
£100 3½% New South Wales Bond, 1930-50		69 10 0	Subscriptions received in advance		14 14 0
Estimated value of Stock of Publications		1,200 0 0	Estimated cost of completing books due to members	1,200	0 0
£200 Victoria 5% Stock (1932-42) held for Medal Fund		179 10 0	£200 Victoria 5% Stock (1932-42) held for Medal Fund	179	10 0
Balance of Account for 1929		2,265 13 4	Balance of receipts over payments due to Medal Fund		5 4 0

## NOTES ON SOME EARLY PLAYS

By W. W. GREG

*'Hycke Scorner': reconstruction of a Treveris edition known only from two leaves*



Y N K Y N de Worde's edition of the interlude of *Hycke Scorner* or *Hyckescorner*, of which the only known copy is in the Garrick collection at the British Museum, is perhaps the earliest impression of an English play that has come down to us. It has indeed been assigned to a date as early as 1510, but Colonel Frank Isaac, who, in connexion with the proposed recasting of the *Short Title Catalogue*, is doing invaluable work in clearing up the chronology of early sixteenth-century printing, informs me that this is not tenable, and that the state of the device at the end (McKerrow 19) points to 1516-17. The book is a quarto of 18 leaves (A<sup>8</sup> B<sup>4</sup> C<sup>6</sup>) with 31 lines to the page, the text beginning on the back of the title and ending above a colophon on the verso of the last leaf.

The Bodleian possesses a unique copy of an edition by John Waley. Waley or Walley was printing from 1546 to 1585, but the words 'God saue the Kynge', which replace de Worde's 'Amen' as a pious conclusion to the text, presumably imply a date before the death of Edward VI in 1553. The book is a quarto of 20 leaves (A-E<sup>4</sup>) with 34 lines to the page: the verso of the title-leaf is blank, the text beginning on A 2 and ending above a colophon on E 4<sup>v</sup>. The increase at once in the number of leaves and the number of lines in each is explained by the fact that, whereas in de Worde's edition the speakers' names are in the outer margins, in Waley's they are centred, so that each adds a line to the apparent length of the text.

It is probable that the play went through quite a number of

editions in the course of half a century, but the only other one whose existence we can prove is that of which a couple of leaves survive in a scrap-book at the British Museum (C. 18. e. 2 (4)). To judge from their appearance these leaves come from an edition printed about 1530. The general arrangement is the same as in de Worde's edition, but there are 34 lines to the quarto page. The printer has not hitherto been identified, but peculiarities noted by Colonel Isaac leave no reasonable doubt that he was Peter Treveris, and favour a date about 1526-7. The problem is, from the two leaves that survive, to reconstruct the make-up of the volume.

The first line preserved, 'On rockes or braches for to renne', corresponds to sig. C 3, l. 22 of de Worde's edition; the last line, 'But me thought that I laye there to longe', corresponds to sig. C 5, l. 2. The end of the text, from this point on, is only 65 lines, which would go onto one leaf and leave room for a short colophon. It is, therefore, probable that the two leaves preserved are the penultimate and antepenultimate of the volume. Further, with 34 lines to the page, the whole text of 1,027 lines would go into 31 pages, which, with a title-page, would make exactly four sheets. Now if the quarto had a normal collation of A-D<sup>4</sup>, the first extant leaf (the last but two) at any rate ought to bear a signature, namely D 2. It may have been left unsigned through inadvertence, but it seems more likely that the book had some such collation as A<sup>6</sup> B<sup>4</sup> C<sup>6</sup> (on the analogy of de Worde's A<sup>8</sup> B<sup>4</sup> C<sup>6</sup>) or even A-B<sup>8</sup>. But if the page of 34 lines was constant, then, working back from the extant fragment, we find that, though the text must have begun on Ar<sup>v</sup>, there can only have been 10 lines on that page. Since it is impossible to suppose that (in addition to the title-page) there was a heading to the text occupying two-thirds of a page, it is clear that the 34-line page cannot have been normal, but was only adopted near the end for the purpose of getting the play into 16 leaves. If we assume that the length of the page

was increased by one line (from 33 to 34) in the last four leaves and that the first speaker's name occupied a line by itself at the head of the text (as it does in de Worde's edition), then it follows that there were exactly 33 lines on A1<sup>v</sup>.

We may, therefore, assume with some confidence that the lost edition was a quarto of 16 leaves, that it had a title-page, that the text began at the top of the page on the back of the title, that whatever finis and colophon there may have been occupied not more than three lines, and that the text filled 23 pages of 33 lines each, 7 pages of 34 lines, and ran its last 31 lines over on to the last page of all.

*Rastell's 'Nature of the Four Elements': printer and date*

The interlude of *The Nature of the Four Elements* exists only in an imperfect copy in the Garrick Collection at the British Museum. It is an octavo, and sheet D together with all after sheet E is missing. That it was written by John Rastell hardly admits of doubt. Bale in his *Illustrium Maioris Britanniae Scriptorum Summarium* (Wesel, 1549) writing of Rastell says that 'longissimam reliquit comœdiam, quam uocabat *Naturam naturatam*', adding the incipit 'Abundas [*sic*] gratia potentiae diuinæ' and the fact that it was in one 'book' ('li. i.'). Since the principal character in the *Four Elements* is 'Nature naturate' and the first line runs: 'Thaboūdant grace of the power deuyne', it is clear that this must be the piece intended by Bale, as Professor A. W. Reed duly remarks in his *Early Tudor Drama*. At the same time I think that Bale's 'li. i.' disposes of Professor Reed's suggestion that the play may have been in two parts (p. 105). Professor Reed has also shown that Rastell probably wrote the interlude soon after his ill-fated voyage of 1516-17, possibly in Ireland, where he seems to have remained for some time after landing at Waterford. If that is so we should expect him to have printed it soon after he returned to London. This he seems to have done in 1519, since

he paid rent for his new house, the Mermaid at Paul's Gate, from Michaelmas that year. At the same time his Newfoundland venture marks a decided break in his career, and though a few books came from his press during the next few years, it is possible that they were rather the work of his assistants, and that he himself did not resume active production before 1525-6. It is to this period, therefore, that one would be inclined to assign the *Four Elements*; but we must bear in mind the possibility that the extant copy may not belong to the original edition—even so severely didactic a work as this may have been reprinted.

The copy at the Museum, being imperfect at the end, has lost any colophon it ever had, and bears no printer's name. On the first page (A1 : there is no regular title-page) is an offset of the device (McKerrow 37) used by John Rastell throughout his career. It is tempting to suppose that the device appeared on the last page of the book, and that the offset occurred when the folded sheets were stacked. The volume, however, contains a note by a former owner to the effect that the play was once bound up with a copy of Rastell's *Abbreviation of the Statutes*, 25 October 1519, and, since this probably had the device at the end, it might account for the offset. There can be no question that the black-letter type in which the play is printed belonged to John Rastell, but the possibility of some one else having used it after him cannot be excluded.

There is, indeed, on sigs. E 5-6, some music that has been supposed to show that the book must have been printed after Rastell's death. The facts are set out by Mr. Robert Steele in his monograph on *The Earliest English Music Printing* (1903, p. 5). He writes :

Rastell (or his successor Gough) is the first to introduce into England the system of printing music at one impression. It seems to have been invented by a French typesetter, Pierre Hautin, in 1525, and type of this description was first used by Attaingant, of Paris, in 1530 in the *Recueil des Chansons*. His type

has no resemblance to that of Gough, which is much ruder. If the date for the *New Interlude* [of the Nature of the Four Elements] is that generally accepted, circa 1520, Rastell has the honour of first introducing one-printing music types. Two works exist in this pioneer type: *A New Interlude* and Coverdale's *Goostly Psalmes*. The latter of these was printed by Gough in [or rather before<sup>1</sup>] 1539, the date of the former is uncertain. The *Interlude* was written circa 1512 [or rather 1517], and is said to have been licensed to Rastell on October 25, 1520, but I can find no authority for the statement. A careful comparison of the types leads me to the conclusion that the copy in the Museum was printed after the *Goostly Psalmes* (1539-1540).

With regard to the last statement, while one cannot but attach great importance to the observation of so careful a scholar as Mr. Steele, it is only fair to say that the impression is by no means borne out by his facsimiles, in which the type looks distinctly fresher in the *Four Elements* than in the *Ghostly Psalms*. Moreover, Colonel Isaac, who has lately examined the two books with special reference to this point, is decidedly of the opposite opinion to Mr. Steele.<sup>2</sup> I should add that Gough was associated with Rastell in the house at the sign of the Mermaid which the latter occupied after his return to London, and that he is found publishing there alone in 1532, after Rastell had given up printing. There would, therefore, be nothing surprising in Gough having printed or reprinted the play in Rastell's type some years after Rastell's death.

<sup>1</sup> The words 'Cum privilegio Regali' in the colophon of the *Ghostly Psalms* proves that the book must have been printed before November 1538, as Mr. Steele has himself pointed out in a note in *The Library*, 1928 (ix. 90). In this note Mr. Steele recapitulates his reasons for dating the *Four Elements* about 1539. He points out that in 1548 Bale wrote that Rastell 'reliquit comœdiam', and argues that this means that he left it in manuscript. But I think that it is as risky to press this phrase as it would be to twist the words Bale used in 1558, 'comœdiam primum edidit', into an assertion that Rastell printed it himself.

<sup>2</sup> In his note in 1928 Mr. Steele repeated that 'the music type in the *Interlude* is more worn than that in the *Goostly Psalmes*', but I do not know whether the assertion was based on a fresh examination of the originals. I should mention that in his chronological list Mr. Steele for some reason placed the *Interlude* before the *Psalms* (*Music Printing*, pp. 36-7).

However, entirely new light has been thrown on the matter by the discovery that the music type in question was used in another publication apparently from John Rastell's press. It was in 1904, the year after Mr. Steele's monograph appeared, that the British Museum acquired a fragment of a certain broadside ballad (K. 8. k. 8), but the significance of this for the present problem was only recognized several years later by Professor A. W. Reed: it has now been further investigated by Colonel Isaac. The fragment has evidently come out of a binding and is very imperfect, but it bears portions of two lines of music undoubtedly printed in the type in question, and at the end the small device (McKerrow 40) with the initials 'IR' and the motto 'Iusticia Regat' used by John Rastell. Dr. McKerrow only noted this in a single book, namely the *Liber Assisarum* printed before December 1516. It is, however, also found in Harrington's *Right Way of Matrimony*, undated, but printed, to judge from the state of the block, after the *Liber Assisarum* and before the ballad. Now, it is, of course, conceivable that after lying discarded for many years the device may have been used by Gough or another after Rastell's death, but it seems on the face of it unlikely, and in the absence of any indication to the contrary we are bound, I think, to conclude that the ballad was printed by Rastell. In that case there is no reason to suppose that he did not print the interlude likewise. But no book is known to have been issued by Rastell after the early months of 1531, so that we may take 1530 as probably the downward limit for the *Four Elements*.

Any attempt to arrive at a more precise date must be on rather conjectural lines. The device of the ballad is of too rare occurrence for the fact that the only date to which it can be certainly assigned is early to carry any weight. On general grounds it is hardly likely that Rastell printed the interlude before 1526, which seems to mark the inception of his second period, when he resumed full activity as a printer after the

disturbance consequent upon his unsuccessful voyage. And this probability finds some evidential support. For in the black-letter of the interlude we find two founts of capital *I* mixed. This mixture occurs in various proportions throughout Rastell's second period, but has not been observed previous to 1526. In the ballad the *I*'s are all of the same (correct) fount, and in the case of a book this would mean that it could hardly have been printed after 1526. But although the fragment preserves rather a large number of *I*'s (namely eighteen) it is clearly not extensive enough to warrant our drawing any conclusion. Another point worth mentioning is that, in spite of bad press-work, the type in which the interlude is printed appears to be fresher and sharper than is usual in Rastell's latest books, and this is also true of the ballad. At the same time it is perhaps not a consideration upon which we should rely heavily. On the whole I see no way of advancing beyond the position that the interlude and the ballad were probably printed by Rastell between 1526 and 1530 inclusive, with some preference for the earlier years of the period. If that is so Rastell's use of his particular species of music type was almost certainly independent of, and very probably anterior to, that of Attaingant at Paris; but it would in no way affect the claim of Hautin to have been its inventor.

*'The Play of the Weather': an alleged edition by Robert Wyer*

John Heywood's *Play of the Weather* is preserved in four different editions. The earliest is a folio printed by William Rastell with the date 1533. The close typographical similarity between this and *The Play of Love*, similarly issued with the date 1534, suggests that both pieces were produced in the winter of 1533-4. There is a fine copy of *The Weather* in the Pepys collection at Magdalene College, Cambridge, and a very poor one at St. John's College, Oxford.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The statement sometimes found that the St. John's library contains an



The next edition must be that of which a unique copy is preserved in the Cambridge University Library. This is a quarto, and having lost the last leaf, which probably bore a colophon, has no printer's name. Sayle (no. 534) rashly identified it with Rastell's edition, being evidently misled by the fact that Herbert (p. 477) described the latter quite erroneously as a quarto. Comparison of the type and ornaments in the U. L. C. copy with those in William Middleton's edition of *The Four PP* leaves no doubt that the two books came from the same press. Middleton was printing from 1541 to 1547, and Professor A. W. Reed (*Early Tudor Drama*, p. 125) has shown that there is reason to associate his interest in Heywood with the date 1544.

An edition by Anthony Kitson, of which the Bodleian possesses a unique copy, may be placed third. It is a quarto: Kitson was printing from 1549 to 1576, and the *S.T.C.* queries 1560 as the date of the present issue.

Last comes an edition by John Awdley, a unique copy of which is in the British Museum. It is again a quarto, and the *S.T.C.* queries 1565 as the date. Awdley was printing from 1559 to 1575, his limits thus falling wholly within those of Kitson. Since, however, the Stationers' Register, in a transfer of 15 January 1582, mentions *The Weather* as having been among Awdley's copies, it seems probable that he owned it after Kitson.

Thus of the four known editions every one except the first has come down to us in a single copy only. The inference is that several editions have wholly perished. There is, however, just a possibility that one other was still preserved in the eighteenth century. In 1749 Ames, who was ignorant of Rastell's edition, gave as among the books printed without date by Robert Wyer: 'Heywoods play of the wether. *Twelves.*'

edition of *The Play of Love* dated 1533, is due to confusion with *The Weather*. It contains no copy of *Love*.

In 1785 Herbert expanded this entry as follows: "The Play of the wether or a new and very mery Enterlude of all maner of Weathers." By John Heywood, 'Twelves.' Meanwhile in 1781 had appeared the third volume of Warton's *History of English Poetry*, where, in an enumeration of Heywood's plays, we read: '*The PLAY of LOVE, or a new and very mery ENTERLUDE of all maner of WEATHERS*, printed in quarto by William Rastell, 1533, and again by Robert Wyer', to which is appended a note: 'In duodecimo. No date. Pr. "Jupiter ryght far so far longe as now were to recyte."' Lastly in 1816 Dibdin again expanding Herbert's entry, obviously without having seen the book, remarked: 'A copy of it (according to Herbert's ms. note) is in the public library at Cambridge.' He gave the size as quarto, presumably also on Herbert's authority.

What are we to make of all this? To begin with, we are bound to assume that the copy Herbert is reported to have noted in the U.L.C. was the one that is still there. And since this was certainly not printed by Wyer, Dibdin's information in no way confirms the existence of an edition by him. Next the additional information given by Herbert in his edition of Ames is evidently derived from Warton, since under William Rastell his entry actually runs: "The Play of Love, or a new and very mery Enterlude of all maner of Weathers." See p. 377 [the Wyer entry]. Quarto. 1533.' Warton had clearly discovered Rastell's edition, which he cites with the correct date, though he miscalls it a quarto. (This may mean that he had seen the copy at St. John's College, which is cut down.) But there is no evidence that he did more than take the reference to Wyer's edition from Ames. It cannot be inferred from his note that he is citing the first line from Wyer's edition rather than Rastell's. True, he quotes it in a corrupt form which it assumes in no extant edition, but considering the absurd muddle he made over the title it would be rash to suppose that the equally absurd form of the incipit is anything than further

evidence of his carelessness.<sup>1</sup> Thus for the existence of an edition by Wyer we are driven back upon the unsupported testimony of Ames, and this cannot be said to be of much weight in the case of a book which, from the form of his entry, one would hardly suppose he had himself examined. On general grounds the existence of such an edition seems unlikely. That it was duodecimo may be dismissed at once. But both Ames and Herbert appear to have been given to describing a book as 'Twelves' when it was in fact an octavo. At this date octavo plays were very rare, but they were not unknown, and Wyer was particularly fond of the size. Still the fact remains that he is not known to have printed a single piece of a dramatic nature. Thus, although at present it would perhaps be rash to deny the existence of a Wyer edition of *The Weather*, until the source of Ames's entry is discovered, I am inclined to treat it as a myth.

*Bale's plays on the Baptism and Temptation*

In his *Scriptorum Summarium*, already mentioned, Bale gives a well-known list of his own plays, 'In idiomate materno comœdias'. He cites in each case the title and the opening words, and notes the number of books or parts. Amongst others he wrote:

Vitam diui Ioannis Baptistæ,	li. xiiij.	Ab Aaron sacerdote primū origi,
De baptismo & tētatione,	co. ij.	Priusquam natus adhuc essem,
De prædicatione Ioannis,	li. i.	Christi regnum iam nunc florere inci.
De Christi tētatione,	li. i.	Post suū baptismū Christus Dei filius,

<sup>1</sup> In Rastell's edition the play begins:

Iupiter.  
Ryght farre to longe as now were to recyte

and the three other editions offer only minute variations. It is almost incredible that any edition should have printed the speaker's name as part of the first line of the text, even if it succeeded in misprinting 'so far' in place of 'to'. Mr. A. L. Poole, librarian of St. John's College, kindly informs me that the opening lines are intact in the copy preserved there.

It has sometimes been supposed that 'De prædicatione Ioannis' referred to the Evangelist, and in consequence Bale has been credited with the authorship of the 'Enterlude of saynt Iohan the Euangelyste' printed by Iohn Waley. But this is a mistake. The position of the 'De prædicatione' between 'De promissionibus diuinis' (*The Chief Promises of God*, virtually a Prophet-play) and the 'De Christi tentatione' (*The Temptation of Christ*) shows that it must be the Baptist who is in question, and the incipit serves to identify it with the 'Iohan Baptystes preachynge in the wyldernesse' or 'Comœdia de Christi Baptismo' printed in the first volume of *The Harleian Miscellany* (1744), which opens with the words: 'The kyngdome of Christ, wyll now begynne to sprynge'. It is clear then that the list affords no reason to suppose that Bale wrote any play on St. John the Evangelist. On the other hand he wrote no less than three introducing the Baptist. The first of these—a *Life of St. John* in fourteen 'books'!—must have been of the nature of an introduction to the next eight items in the list, which evidently formed a regular New Testament cycle, beginning with a *Christ and the Doctors* ('De Christo duodēni'), including a two-part *Baptism and Temptation* as the second play, and ending with a *Burial and Resurrection*. All these have perished. But towards the end of the list we find another and smaller group that has been more fortunate. It consists of *The Chief Promises of God*, *John Baptist's Preaching*, *The Temptation of Christ*, and *The Three Laws*. Of these the second survives in the reprint already mentioned, the other three in the original editions printed at Wesel in 1547-8. They are all identified by their opening words. Perhaps it is too much to speak of these four plays as forming a cycle, but at least the *Preaching* and *Temptation* are closely related alike in subject and structure.

Having thus cleared the ground I want to call attention to a peculiarity of the original edition of *The Temptation of Christ*,

the only known copy of which is in the Douce collection at the Bodleian. It is a quarto consisting of nine leaves only, namely a title-leaf, on the back of which the text begins, and two gatherings of four leaves each signed D and E. It is obvious that something must have preceded the extant play and it is natural to suppose that this was *John Baptist's Preaching*, as in Bale's list. This suggestion is not new for the possibility occurred to Francis Douce a century ago, as appears from some notes he made at the beginning of his copy. The question is how far it can be checked.

Owing to the use of leads and the occasional presence of run-over lines it is not easy to secure a very exact calculation, but a careful count makes the text of the *Preaching* 90 print-lines longer than that of the *Temptation*, and these would occupy just under three pages. Now the text of the *Temptation*, including the colophon, fills exactly 17 pages, so that the text of the *Preaching* would go into 20. The title-page of the latter must have been similar to that of the former, and presumably contained the title proper, a small woodcut of St. Luke above a text from his gospel, and a list of characters. Thus if the text began on the back of the title, as it does in the *Temptation*, it would end on C<sub>3</sub>, leaving C<sub>3</sub><sup>v</sup> blank. Since, as we have seen, the title of the *Temptation* is printed on C<sub>4</sub>, I think we shall be justified in assuming that it was indeed *John Baptist's Preaching* that occupied the missing portion of the volume.

We are left speculating whether it was from leaves actually abstracted from the Douce copy that the *Preaching* was printed in *The Harleian Miscellany* and whether they were destroyed in the process.

There is one further point to be noticed. Herbert (p. 1548) records in consecutive entries *John Baptist's Preaching*, *The Temptation of Christ*, and *The Three Laws*. For the first he refers to *The Harleian Miscellany*, for the second he gives no

reference but evidently copied the entry in Ames, while for the third he gives a reference to Warton, though the addition of the initials 'W.H.' shows that he is actually describing a copy in his own collection. He calls all three octavos: this is correct in the case of the one he himself possessed; in the other two entries he copied the error from Ames. But to Ames's title of the *Temptation* he added the words: 'In a compartment representing the fall of Adam'. Now the extant quarto has no compartment, its only ornament is a small woodcut of St. Matthew: on the other hand *The Three Laws* has just such a compartment as Herbert describes, though Herbert does not mention it in his description, in spite of the fact that he possessed a copy. It is therefore not necessary to follow Douce in supposing that Herbert had seen a different edition of the *Temptation*: his note merely found its way into the wrong entry.

## RECENT BIBLIOGRAPHICAL WORK IN GERMANY

By ERNST CROUS



IN Germany, the time when a tram ticket had to be paid with a farthing or so and people could not afford even that, when the journals died away and even valuable books were printed on the worst paper or could not be printed at all, this time came to an end by the stabilization of the mark in November 1923. So a report on recent bibliographical work in Germany may start with the year 1924 though in a few cases older publications will be named as well.

Of the two uses of the word Bibliography the narrower, which restricts it mainly to enumeration, now prevails in Germany, the wider (in German usually expressed by *Buchwesen* or *Buchkunde*) in the English-speaking world. The present paper as dealing with Germany follows mainly the German use, but since it is written for English readers is enlarged at the end to include the topics they will expect.

The first publication to be named is the *Handbuch der Bibliographie* by Georg Schneider, which was published in 1923, reprinted in 1924 and 1926 and will have been published in a revised edition, when the present article is in the hands of its readers. The first edition, the result of fifteen years' work, consists of a theoretical and historical part of two hundred pages and a practical and descriptive part of about three hundred. Part I tries to show what bibliography is, the names, forms, and kinds of bibliographies, how the titles a bibliography contains are collected, copied, and arranged, and what is the history of bibliography. Part II gives an annotated survey of

the more important general bibliographies and catalogues, international and national, excluding bibliographies of single sciences or special topics, but including those of bibliographies, books for bibliophiles, incunabula and best books, reviews and encyclopaedias and journals, publications of societies and of schools of every description, official publications and privately printed books, anonyma and pseudonyma and biographies. The new edition, which I have been permitted to see in the proofsheets, reduces the first part to an enlarged historical chapter and increases the second by more than one half.

While both in Great Britain and in the United States bibliographical societies are strong supporters of bibliographical work, in Germany the only society called 'bibliographical', the Deutsche Bibliographische Gesellschaft, fell a victim to war and inflation. But to some extent the bibliophile societies take charge of bibliographical work also. Thus the papers read to the Berliner Bibliophilen-Abend are devoted to 'Bücherkunde, Bibliophilie und Bibliographie' and among the publications of the (Weimar) Gesellschaft der Bibliophilen we find the *Deutsches Anonymen-Lexikon* by Michael Holzmann and Hans Bohatta, a seventh volume of which containing supplements and corrections for the years 1501-1926 appeared in 1928. A journal that has bibliography for its first object, the *Archiv für Bibliographie, Buch- und Bibliothekswesen*, was founded in 1926, its first article (by Ewald Horn) asking: What is bibliography? A very considerable part of bibliographical work is—quite naturally—done by booksellers and librarians; chief centres are the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin and the Deutsche Bücherei at Leipzig, and journals of bibliographical importance (besides the *Archiv für Bibliographie* and the *Minerva-Zeitschrift*) are the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* and the *Börsenblatt für den Deutschen Buchhandel*. Special bibliographies of course come from all quarters. From the libraries teaching of bibliography has also invaded the universities.



As to the booksellers, a remarkable paper was read to the Berliner Bibliophilen-Abend on 10 November 1925 concerning the scientific and the bibliophile antiquarian bookseller;<sup>1</sup> in this paper Dr. Wilhelm Junk, the well-known scientific bookseller, points out that the two kinds of second-hand booksellers differ from one another as well in their catalogues as in other respects; the scientific aspires to completeness of his lists on a single science or topic, even by adding pamphlets and separata, the bibliophile to a description in detail of a select list of valuable books.<sup>2</sup> An article of Bohatta in the *Archiv für Bibliographie* (2, 1927-9) shows the usefulness of second-hand booksellers' and auctioneers' catalogues for bibliographers.

As to the librarians, the transactions of their annual meetings often concern bibliographical objects. Thus we must take note of the paper read by Professor Richard Fick, director of the Göttingen Library, to the meeting held at Göttingen in 1928<sup>3</sup> and of the article of Dr. Schneider in the *Kuhnert Festschrift (Von Büchern und Bibliotheken, Berlin, 1928)*. They recommend greater attention to bibliography and bibliographies in the training of the librarians and in the daily work of the libraries. A great help to all bibliographical work, the inter-library loan system of Prussia, is since 1 March 1924 extended to the whole Reich;<sup>4</sup> since 1 November 1924 there

<sup>1</sup> Printed in Nos. 278 and 280 of the *Börsenblatt für den Deutschen Buchhandel* of the same year; and also published separately.

<sup>2</sup> In an article which Dr. Junk has contributed to the *Festschrift zum 50 jährigen Bestehen der Buchhandlung Gustav Fock (Aus Wissenschaft und Antiquariat, Leipzig, 1929)*, he especially deals with the aims and objects of a scientific antiquarian bookseller.

<sup>3</sup> Printed in the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, 45, 1928, and also in the *Verhandlungen des Deutschen Bibliothekartages*, 24. Versammlung (Göttingen, 1928), Leipzig, 1928.

<sup>4</sup> The 'Leihverkehrsordnung für die Deutschen Bibliotheken' is published in the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, 41, 1924, pp. 138-40; the list of 753 libraries annexed on 1 April 1929 in the *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Bibliotheken*, 20, 1929, pp. 290-301 (also printed separately and added to the June number 1929 of the

exists besides a special arrangement among the libraries of South-West Germany.<sup>1</sup>

As to the universities, another article of Dr. Schneider, in the Hiersemann Festschrift (*Werden und Wirken*, Leipzig, 1924), discusses the relations between bibliography and science, while Professor Fick in the paper already mentioned, Professor Leiding, keeper of the manuscripts in the Munich Library, in a paper also read at the Göttingen meeting of 1928, and Professor Albert Schramm in an article in the *Zeitschrift für Buchkunde*, published as long ago as 1924, unite in asking for 'Bibliographie', 'Bibliothekswissenschaft', 'Buchkunde' to be made a recognized part of university teaching. At present, a Bibliothekswissenschaftliches Institut connected with the University of Berlin has existed since the autumn of 1928, and here Dr. Schneider lectures on the history and theory of bibliography. At the University of Leipzig we have Lehrgänge zur Ausbildung für den höheren Bibliotheksdienst, where Professor Glauning, director of the University Library, gives introductory lectures on bibliography. At the Universities of Göttingen and Munich bibliography is represented by Professor Fick and the former director of the University Library of Munich, Professor Georg Wolff, respectively.

*Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*); a supplement to this list in the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, 46, 1929, p. 618. A report on the working of the German loan system was read to the Vienna meeting of the librarians in 1927 (printed in the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, 44, 1927, pp. 449-62) by Dr. Abb of the Berlin Library; cf. also his remarks on 'Die erste deutsche Leihverkehrsliste' in the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, 46, 1929, pp. 353-54.

<sup>1</sup> A report on this arrangement was given to the Freiburg meeting of the librarians in 1925 (printed in the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, 42, 1925, pp. 456-61) by Dr. Rest of the Freiburg Library. At the same opportunity Dr. Berghoeffer, then director of the Rothschildsche Bibliothek at Frankfurt on the Main, gave an interesting report (printed at the same place, pp. 442-55) on his Frankfurt 'Sammelkatalog' which comprises the printed catalogues of German libraries and is of great value for the South-west German loan system as well as for Frankfurt itself and the Berlin information bureau.

The questions of principles most frequently dealt with in the last years are those concerning decimal classification and subject catalogues, both of interest for bibliographers as well as for librarians.

Up to the present the largest bibliography in German arranged according to the decimal classification is one which appeared in 1927 as the beginning of a general index to the first 20 volumes of the *Bibliographisches Bulletin der Schweiz*. It bears the title: *Systematisches Verzeichnis der Schweizerischen oder die Schweiz betreffenden Veröffentlichungen 1901-1920*, 1. Band (Katalog der Schweizerischen Landesbibliothek). The discussion of the principle went through newspapers and journals and pamphlets and culminated for the present in the 1928 meeting of the librarians at Göttingen where papers were read by the champion of the 'decimalists' Dr. Hanauer, librarian of the Allgemeine Elektrizitäts-Gesellschaft, and by Dr. Schneider, one of his chief opponents.<sup>1</sup> Another opponent, Dr. Karl Diesch, director of the Königsberg Library, wrote an article on the subject in the number of the *Minerva-Zeitschrift* celebrating this meeting and another soon afterwards in the *Börsenblatt für den Deutschen Buchhandel* (No. 236); also in 1929 a book entitled *Katalogprobleme und Dezimalklassifikation*. There is a real interest in Germany in decimal classification, especially with people interested in natural sciences, technics and economics, rationalization, and standardization.<sup>2</sup> The committee for standardization in library affairs (Fachnormenausschuss für Bibliothekswesen) has taken it up, the Technisch-wissenschaftliche Lehrmittelzentrale in Berlin, and the librarians of the polytechnics at Aachen and at Danzig, Karl Walther and Dr. Fritz Prinzhorn, are fighting for it. But the majority of the librarians will at best admit an only very restricted use of the system. The debates at Göttingen resulted in a resolution to

<sup>1</sup> Both papers are printed in the proceedings of this meeting cited above.

<sup>2</sup> As to Switzerland, cf. the *Schweizer Sammler*, 3, 1929, pp. 77-8.

the effect that the meeting recommended the printing of a German translation of the decimal classification in the Brussels form of 1927 and first of all of its index, and that the meeting charged the commission for technical libraries and the committee for standardization in library affairs to prepare and to achieve this. A German translation of class O was published in 1929.

The problems of the subject catalogue are treated in a series of articles in the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* by Hans Schleimer, Franz Schmid, Franz Koch, and Franz Dölger, also in a paper of Dr. Eichler read to the librarians' meeting at Erfurt in 1924 (printed in the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* of that year) and by the following publications: *Vorschriften für den Schlagwortkatalog der National-Bibliothek in Wien*, with an introduction by Franz Koch, Wien, 1924, and Hans Schleimer, *Die schlagwortmässige Katalogisierung der mathematischen Literatur*, Leipzig, 1926.

The decimal classification is more discussed in North Germany, the subject catalogue more in the South. A report on the new 'Sachkatalog' of Mainz made by Dr. Eppelsheimer to the librarians' meeting at Königsberg in 1929<sup>1</sup> reveals the fact that in a place just between North and South this systematic catalogue on the one hand uses keys reminiscent of the decimal classification and on the other avowedly approximates to a subject catalogue.

Problems of alphabetical catalogues are dealt with by Dale Sass in her *Erläuterungen zu den Instruktionen für die alphabetischen Kataloge der preussischen Bibliotheken*, Leipzig, 1927; how to describe German illustrated books of the seventeenth century in a bibliographically satisfying way, is explained and shown by Hans von Müller in his thorough bibliography of the writings of Lohenstein 1652-1748 in the already cited Hierse-

<sup>1</sup> Printed in the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, 46, 1929, and in the *Verhandlungen des Deutschen Bibliothekartages*, 25. Versammlung (Königsberg, 1929), Leipzig, 1929.

mann Festschrift. Johannes Lemcke devotes a book to Vincent Placcius and his importance for the bibliography of anonyma and pseudonyma (*Mitteilungen aus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek*, Band 1, Hamburg, 1925), Ernst Darmstaedter an article in the *Bücherhirt* (1, 1928) to the libraries of bibliographers (Brunet, Ebert, and Graesse).

An annual international *Bibliographie des Bibliotheks- und Buchwesens*, comprising something like a bibliography of bibliographies, appeared from 1904 to 1912 under the editorship of Adalbert Hortzschansky as *Beiblatt zum Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, based on the monthly bibliography of this journal. It appeared again and in much the same way for 1922 and 1923 under the editorship of Richard Meckelein, for 1924 under that of Rudolf Hoecker and for 1925 under that of Hoecker and Joris Vorstius. Then the bibliography was separated from the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* (where Hoecker and Vorstius continued the monthly bibliographies) and reorganized; under the editorship of Hoecker and Vorstius it now appears as *Internationale Bibliographie des Buch- und Bibliothekswesens mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Bibliographie*.

The *Literarisches Zentralblatt für Deutschland* (Leipzig) and *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* (Berlin) have been the best-known German reviews for decades. In 1923, the inflation had reduced the former to about a third, the latter even to a tenth of its earlier extent. Both were reorganized in 1924. The 45th year of the *Literaturzeitung*, under the editorship of Paul Hinneberg as before, was counted as the first year of a new series, the journal becoming an official publication of the German academies. During the 75th year of the *Zentralblatt*, which now became a publication of the Börsenverein der Deutschen Buchhändler, Eduard Zarncke as editor was replaced by Wilhelm Frels. Since 1927 the journal is edited by the Deutsche Bücherei, Hans Praesent acting as editor. It reviews a small selection of foreign books much as before, but is mainly

a systematically arranged bibliography of German books and articles, often with short remarks concerning their contents. Whereas the *Literaturzeitung* again appears weekly, the *Zentralblatt* now appears fortnightly. Since 1924 also a *Jahresbericht des Literarischen Zentralblattes* is issued being a systematically arranged index to the journal. Each annual report now contains more than 30,000 German titles, of which over a thousand concern 'Buch- und Schriftwesen'. *German Books, a selection from the most important publications of the years 1914-1925, exhibited at New York by the 'Börsenverein der Deutschen Buchhändler'*, Leipzig, 1925, contains 15,000 titles, including fiction and fine books, the texts being in English and in German. A list of German books which have been translated into foreign languages in 1927 is published by Löwis of Menar in the *Börsenblatt für den Deutschen Buchhandel* 1928 (Nos. 137, 165, 192, 245); the work has been continued for 1928 in 1929.

As to printed library catalogues, we hope that the printing of the Prussian Union Catalogue will start in 1930; it would be a contribution to bibliography even larger than the catalogue of the British Museum or that of the Bibliothèque Nationale. Since 1 January 1928 the *Berliner Titeldrucke* record the accessions not only (as before) of the State Library and the ten Prussian University Libraries and of publications issued in 1892 or later, but also of the libraries of the four Prussian polytechnics and of *all* printed books. The National Library at Vienna publishes lists of accessions since 1923 (*Zuwachsverzeichnis der Druckschriften der National-Bibliothek in Wien*, with a supplement concerning the special collections, manuscripts, &c.) as a kind of Austrian bibliography.

Much has been done for periodicals. The *Gesamtverzeichnis der ausländischen Zeitschriften (GAZ)*, 1914-24, herausgegeben vom Auskunftsbureau der deutschen Bibliotheken, Berlin, 1929, enumerates alphabetically about 15,000 foreign periodicals, volumes of which have been published in the aforesaid years,

and locates copies of these volumes in at least one of about two-thirds of more than 1,500 German libraries in connexion with the information bureau; if the Berlin Library possesses a volume, its press-mark also is added.<sup>1</sup> The well-known *Bibliographie der fremdsprachigen Zeitschriftenliteratur*, edited by Felix Dietrich, Gautzsch bei Leipzig, discontinued in the time of inflation, has reappeared in 1927, the new series starting with 1925. The Börsenverein der Deutschen Buchhändler has become editor and publisher of *Sperlings Zeitschriften-Adressbuch*, *Handbuch der deutschen Presse*, in 1923 and supplemented it in 1927 by an *Adressbuch der fremdsprachigen Zeitschriften und Zeitungen* (compiler: Friedrich Vogel-sang).<sup>2</sup> Joachim Kirchner prepares a publication on the *Grundlagen des deutschen Zeitschriftenwesens mit einer Gesamtbibliographie der deutschen Zeitschriften bis zum Jahre 1790*; the first part (*Bibliographische und buchhandelsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* especially on the costs and the names of the journals) has already appeared (Leipzig, 1928). Hans Köhring has made a *Bibliographie der Almanache, Kalender und Taschenbücher für die Zeit von ca. 1750-1860* (Hamburg, 1929). Newspapers are dealt with by Karl Bömer in his *Bibliographisches Handbuch der Zeitungswissenschaft, kritische und systematische Einführung in den Stand der deutschen Zeitungsforschung* (Leipzig, 1929). *Ich hab's* (by Franz Winkler) is an alphabetical list

<sup>1</sup> In Switzerland have been published a *Verzeichnis der laufenden schweizerischen Zeitschriften mit Einschluss der Zeitungen, Jahrbücher, Kalender, Serien usw.*, 2nd ed., Bern, 1925 (with a supplement of 1926) and a *Verzeichnis ausländischer Zeitschriften in schweizerischen Bibliotheken*, 3rd ed., Zürich, 1925 (Publikationen der Vereinigung schweizerischer Bibliothekare 6). An Austrian list is: *Verzeichnis der Zeitschriften und Periodika an wissenschaftlichen Anstalten Tirols und Vorarlbergs*, bearbeitet von Franz Mayr, Innsbruck (1927).

<sup>2</sup> *Gracklauer's Zeitschriften-Katalog*, edited by Herbert Goldacker, Leipzig, 1928 (with a supplement 1929) aims at being a cheap bibliography of current German journals; Gracklauer is systematically arranged like *Sperling* and *Vogelsang* and also has an alphabetical index.



of catchwords and authors of Sammlung Göschel, Inselbücherei, Reclams Universal-Bibliothek and twenty other German publishers' series (2nd ed. = *Archiv für Bibliographie*, Beiheft 5, in course of publication since 1929; 1st ed. Linz, 1927).

Two new periodicals are devoted to official publications. Since 1928 the Reichsministerium des Innern following the English and American pattern has published a *Monatliches Verzeichnis der reichsdeutschen amtlichen Druckschriften* which the Deutsche Bücherei compiles. Since the same year the Berlin Library publishes *Deutsche amtliche Druckschriften, Erwerbungen der Staatsbibliothek*, the first volume (compiled by Dr. Feldkamp) recording the accessions of the year 1927. Of course both publications partly refer to the same objects, but the point of view differs; the one is more bibliography (with prices), the other more catalogue (with pressmarks), &c. A methodical handbook has been written by Georg Schwidetzky: *Deutsche Amtsdruksachenkunde*, Leipzig, 1927 (*Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, Beiheft 59).

A personal bibliography may only enumerate works of a single person or of a special group of persons; it may also enumerate the literature on a single person or on a special group of persons (and perhaps their works likewise). Bibliographies of the first kind are e. g. those of Schiller (by Herbert Marcuse, Berlin, 1925), Steiner (by C. S. Picht, Dornach, 1926), Harnack (by Friedrich Smend, Leipzig, 1927), and Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (*Wilamowitz-Bibliographie 1868-1929*, Berlin, 1929). The 'Festschriften' (since 1928 lists of them are given by Otto Erich Ebert in the *Minerva-Zeitschrift*) very often record the works of the man to whom the 'Festschrift' is dedicated; many bibliographies of this description will be found in *Hoecker-Vorstius*. What has appeared in the publications of the Göttingen Academy from 1751 to 1927 is listed by Max Arnim (*Autorenverzeichnis zu den Veröffentlich-*



lungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Göttingen, 1928) alphabetically according to author's names. What has been published by officials of the Berlin Library, is catalogued in the *Jahresbericht der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek* 1925, Berlin, 1927 (additions in the following reports). *Kürschners Deutscher Literatur-Kalender* for some decades has compiled the publications of living authors; since 1925 the *Kürschner* is divided in two parts, *Kürschners Deutscher Gelehrten-Kalender* (blue) for the scholars and the *Literatur-Kalender* (red) for the other writers. Bibliographies of the second kind are e.g. those of 'Dante in Deutschland' by Theodor Ostermann, Heidelberg, 1929,<sup>1</sup> of Michelangelo by Ernst Steinmann and Rudolf Wittkower, Leipzig, 1927,<sup>2</sup> of Dürer by Hans Wolfgang Singer, 2nd ed., Strassburg, 1928,<sup>3</sup> and of Mozart by Otto Keller, Berlin, 1927; of Goethe (*Katalog der Sammlung Kippenberg*, 2nd ed., Leipzig, 1928), of Jean Paul (by Eduard Berend, Berlin, 1925), of Arnim and Brentano (both by Otto Mallon, Berlin, 1925 and 1926),<sup>4</sup> and of Walter Rathenau (by Ernst Gottlieb, Berlin, 1929 = *Schriften der Walther-Rathenau-Stiftung*, 3). *Bio-Bibliographische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Rechts- und Staatswissenschaften* (Berlin, since 1924) deal with Lenin, Lujo Brentano, Schulze Gaevernitz, and others. A *Neue Oesterreichische Biographie*, 1815-1918, edited by Anton Bettelheim, and a *Deutsches Biographisches Jahrbuch* starting with 1914, edited by the German academies, have been in course of publication since 1923 and 1925 respectively, both including bibliographies. By the second, Bettelheim's *Biographisches Jahrbuch und Deutscher Nekrolog* immediately and the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*

<sup>1</sup> *Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher*, Reihe 2. 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Römische Forschungen der Biblioteca Hertziana*, 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Studien zur Deutschen Kunstgeschichte*, 41.

<sup>4</sup> Reviewed by Hans von Müller with remarks on the methods of bibliography in the *Euphorion*, 28, 1927, pp. 313-17.

mediately are continued. The first volume of a *Katalog der fürstlich Stolberg-Stolberg'schen Leichenpredigten-Sammlung*—the collection of printed funeral sermons at Stolberg being the largest in Germany—has been published in 1927 (Bibliothek familiengeschichtlicher Quellen, 2).

Space will not permit me to review here the many and often valuable bibliographies of single sciences or special topics; they are to be found in *Hoecker-Vorstius*. But the bibliographies of what concerns the books themselves, apart from their contents, must be recorded, and also something of book-love and booklore.

Though in these times of cinema and broadcast the general interest for books may be reduced, the circle of bibliophiles has increased. There are now more or less bibliophile societies, the Soncino-Gesellschaft der Freunde des jüdischen Buches and the Wiegendruck-Gesellschaft (both since 1924, the first publishing the *Soncino-Blätter*) and the Gesellschaft alpinen Bücherfreunde (since 1928, publishing the journal *Berg und Buch*); local societies have been founded at Essen in 1925, at Dresden in 1926, at Bremen in 1927, &c. The aims and objects of the love of books and of societies of bibliophiles have been discussed at a meeting of representatives of these societies at Munich early in 1928 and late in that year at the Vienna meeting of the (Weimar) Gesellschaft der Bibliophilen, which is something like a mother society in regard to the others. These discussions resulted in a new 'Arbeitsausschuss' of representatives of the daughter societies, to assist the managing committee of the Weimar society, and in a reorganization of its official journal, the *Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde*. The discussions were continued in this periodical by its editor Georg Witkowski (N.F. 20, 1928, pp. 99-100) and others (N.F. 21, 1929, Beiblatt, cols. 1-9 and 97-100), and the remarkable paper read by Professor Christian H. Kleukens to the Mainz meeting of the Weimar society in 1929 (Buchdrucker und Buch-

freund, ein heikles Thema)<sup>1</sup> also has something to do with them. The questions of principles were of course also discussed before the local societies, in Berlin by Fedor von Zobeltitz in 1925,<sup>2</sup> and again in 1929, by Dr. Wilhelm Junk in 1928,<sup>3</sup> at Dresden by Professor Heinrich Wieynck.<sup>4</sup> It was blamed that the meetings sometimes were more social meetings than meetings of booklovers; it was asked for co-operation of the societies with one another; the adherents of modern books stood against those of ancient books; scientific books also wanted to be noticed by the bibliophiles. It was acknowledged that the bibliophile movement had beneficially influenced book-production; Junk and Zobeltitz especially advised that more interest should now be taken in enumerative bibliography.

Periodicals have come and gone. The *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Vereins für Buchwesen und Schrifttum* was in 1927 replaced by the annual *Buch und Schrift*. Albert Schramm edited in 1924 and 1925 the *Zeitschrift für Buchkunde* and has been editing since 1925 the *Taschenbuch für Bücherfreunde* and since 1927 the *Archiv für Schreib- und Buchwesen*. The *Monatshefte für Bücherfreunde und Graphiksammler*, edited by Hans Loubier and Willy Kurth, did not outlive its first year (1925). The *Bücherstube*, *Blätter für Freunde des Buches und der zeichnenden Künste*, edited by Ernst Schulte-Strathaus, founded in 1920, died in 1927. Since 1924, under dem Patronat der Schweizer Bibliophilengesellschaft, there have appeared *Taschenbibliographien für Büchersammler*; William Josef Meyer

<sup>1</sup> A report is given in the *Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde*, N. F. 21, 1929, pp. 119-20.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. his article in the *Gutenberg-Festschrift* of 1925 (Bibliophilie als Wissenschaft).

<sup>3</sup> *Wege und Ziele bibliophiler Vereinigungen*, Berlin, 1929; a short report being published in the *Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde*, N. F. 21, 1929, Beiblatt, cols. 7-9).

<sup>4</sup> *Zeitgemässe Bibliophilie*, Dresden, 1928; also in the *Börsenblatt für den Deutschen Buchhandel* of that year (No. 121).

started the *Schweizer Sammler* (called at first: *Bulletin für Schweizer Sammler*) in 1927 and Herbert Reichner (Vienna) his *Philobiblon* in 1928.

In 1925 the Deutsches Buchmuseum at Leipzig was 40 years old, the Gutenberg-Museum at Mainz and that at Bern 25. The Leipzig Museum then changed its rooms which now are in the west wing of the Deutsche Bücherei, the Mainz Museum (in the Stadtbibliothek) enlarged its rooms; the Bern Museum (in the Historisches Museum) had done the same already in 1922. Albert Schramm gave a detailed description of the Leipzig Museum in the *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Vereins für Buchwesen und Schrifttum* (8, 1925);<sup>1</sup> Karl J. Lüthi made two speeches on the Bern Museum which are printed in the organ of the society of its friends, *Schweizerisches Gutenbergmuseum* (11, 1925). The jubilee of the Gutenberg-Museum at Mainz was celebrated by great festivals in June 1925 and by the publication of a *Gutenberg-Festschrift* which is continued by a *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch* since 1926; the Gutenberg-Gesellschaft has in 1926 also started a series of 'Kleine Drucke'; in its 'Veröffentlichungen' a large work of Gottfried Zedler on Gutenberg and Schöffer has begun to appear. Aloys Bömer and he discussed the question Coster or Gutenberg in the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* of 1926 and 1929. There have been many exhibitions in the museums and in the libraries; here it will be sufficient to name the Internationale Buchkunstausstellung at Leipzig in 1927 and the Internationale Presseausstellung at Cologne in 1928.

'Wie wenige unter den Neulingen wollen von Typenkunde, Inkunabeln, alter Druckgeschichte noch etwas wissen!' What is said by Witkowski (in the article cited above) of the bibliophiles, may be said to some extent of the librarians too. Notwithstanding there has been much activity in this field also. Bohatta published an *Einführung in die Buchkunde* (Wien, 1927,

<sup>1</sup> Also published separately.

2nd ed., 1928) which deals especially with the ancient book, Konrad Haebler a *Handbuch der Inkunabelkunde* (Leipzig, 1925). Haebler has also obliged us by a book on *Die deutschen Buchdrucker des XV. Jahrhunderts im Auslande* (München, 1924), another on *Die italienischen Fragmente vom Leiden Christi, das älteste Druckwerk Italiens* (Beiträge zur Forschung, Studien aus dem Antiquariat Jacques Rosenthal, N. F. 1, München, 1927) and three series of leaves from German, Italian, and West European incunabula with explanations (*Der deutsche—italienische—westeuropäische Wiegendruck in Original-Typenbeispielen*, München, 1927 and 1928). This has been supplemented by W. L. Schreiber's *Der Buchholzschnitt im 15. Jahrhundert*, München, 1929. Haebler is also connected with a splendid catalogue of the *Frühdrucke aus der Bücherei Victor von Klemperer* (Dresden, 1927). Schreiber in 1926 started a second edition of his *Manuel de l'amateur de la gravure sur bois et sur métal au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle* under the title: *Handbuch der Holz- und Metallschnitte des XV. Jahrhunderts*.

Since 1925 the well-known *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* has been in course of publication.<sup>1</sup> To get financial means for this large work, the Incunabula Society has been founded which has up to the present published for its members two facsimilia of incunabula (one containing a bibliography of the *Mirabilia Romae*, printed by Planck) and is now publishing a bibliography of incunabula literature. In a paper read to the Wiegendruck-Gesellschaft and the Gutenberg-Gesellschaft in 1925 (printed in the same year for both societies), Professor Erich von Rath regards researches into the exterior of the incunabula as the proper *Aufgaben der Wiegendruckforschung*;<sup>2</sup> whereas Ernst

<sup>1</sup> For reports cf. the *Jahresberichte der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek* and the *Minerva-Zeitschrift*, 1, 1924-5, pp. 28-30; for critical remarks the review of Ernst Schulz in the *Archiv für Bibliographie* (1, 1926) and the introduction of Arnold C. Klebs to *Die ersten gedruckten Pestschriften* (München, 1926).

<sup>2</sup> He has dealt with the history of the incunabula researches in the Hiersemann

Schulz (*Aufgaben und Ziele der Inkunabelforschung*, München, 1924) pleads for the contents of the fifteenth-century books as the principal object of incunabula research. While in 1924 Haebler completed his *Typenrepertorium der Wiegendrucke* which seeks to help to discover the printer by the types used in a book without printer's name, and while an article of his (*Schriftguss und Schriftenhandel in der Frühdruckzeit*)<sup>1</sup> denied the existence of typefoundries independent of printing plants in the fifteenth century, in 1929 Ernst Consentius (*Die Typen der Inkunabelzeit*) tried to prove this existence and to disprove the possibility of recognizing the printer by the types. Alfred Hessel (*Von der Schrift zum Druck*)<sup>2</sup> who was followed by Joachim Kirchner and myself (*Die gotischen Schriftarten*, Leipzig, 1928) endeavours to bring palaeography and the knowledge of printing types into touch and to differentiate the types according to styles, chiefly as represented by the lower-case letters. The 'Zukunft der Typenforschung' was discussed by a paper of mine read to the Berlin meeting of the Incunabula Society in 1929. I also compiled a preliminary list of facsimilia of fifteenth-century books (*Zeitschrift für Buchkunde*, 1, 1924). Complete lists of fifteenth-century printers' and publishers' marks have been published by Ernst Weil (Germany) in 1924, Wilhelm Josef Meyer (France) in 1926, Rudolf Juchhoff (Netherlands, England, Spain, Bohemia, Moravia, and Poland) in 1927 and Max

Festschrift (Vorläufer des Gesamtkatalogs der Wiegendrucke) and (Zur Biographie Ludwig Hains) in the Collijn Festschrift (*Bok- och Bibliotekshistoriska Studier* Uppsala, 1925). Another contribution to this history ('Das Inkunabelverzeichnis Bernhards von Mallinckrodt' by Kurt Ohly) is published in the Bömer Festschrift (*Westfälische Studien*, Leipzig, 1928).

<sup>1</sup> In the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, 41, 1924, in the *Typographische Jahrbücher*, 45, 1924, and separately (Leipzig, 1925); a translation ('Typefoundry and Commerce in Type during the early years of Printing') was published in the *Ars typographica*, 3, 1926.

<sup>2</sup> In the *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Vereins für Buchwesen und Schrifttum*, 6, 1923, and also separately.

Josef Husung (Italy) in 1929. Juchhoff, in the *Bömer Festschrift*, also traces the activity of Johann and Konrad de Westphalia at Venice and Strassburg.

Prominent among scholars concerned with the sixteenth century is Karl Schottenloher. In 1925 he gave a 'Kleinbild aus dem Münchner Aerzteleben des XVI Jahrhunderts' (*Doktor Alexander Seitz und seine Schriften*) and also published a bibliography of the productions of Schobser (*Der Münchner Buchdrucker Hans Schobser 1500-30*), at the same time solving the question: Wer ist Johann Locher von München? In 1927 there followed 'ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der evangelischen Publizistik': *Pfalzgraf Ottheinrich und das Buch* (Reformationsgeschichtliche Studien und Texte, 50-1) with a bibliography of the Neuburg printer Hans Kilian and with an appendix on the 'Reformationsschrifttum in der Palatina'. In 1929 the same series (No. 53) contained a book of his: *Flugschriften zur Ritterschaftsbewegung des Jahres 1523*. Printers of the sixteenth century were dealt with by Albert Piel (*Geschichte des ältesten Bonner Buchdrucks Rheinisches Archiv*, 4, 1924) and Hans Bahlow (*Die Anfänge des Buchdrucks zu Liegnitz*, Liegnitz, 1928), Martin von Hase (*Johann Michael, genannt Michel Buchführer alias Michel Kremer*, Strassburg, 1928 = *Studien zur Deutschen Kunstgeschichte*, 260) and Heinrich Jentsch (*Nickel Schmidt (Nicolaus Faber) und Michael Blum*, Wolfenbüttel, 1928 = *Archiv für Schreib- und Buchwesen*, Sonderheft 1). Aloys Bömer supplemented his bibliography of the Münster printing in the first quarter of the sixteenth century by another: *Der münsterische Buchdruck vom zweiten Viertel bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts* (in *Westfalen*, 12th year, and also separately: Münster, 1924). The origin of Fraktur type was examined by Gustav Milchsack in his pamphlet: *Was ist Fraktur?* (2nd ed. by Heinrich Schneider, Braunschweig, 1925), and the *Herkunft und Bedeutung der Antiqua und Fraktur im Werke Albrecht Dürers* by Alfons Oslender in an only type-written



Munich thesis of 1924. A favourite object of researches into sixteenth-century books has been the illustrations. Heinrich Röttinger continued his work on these in the *Studien zur Deutschen Kunstgeschichte* (229, 1925: *Erhard Schön und Niklas Stör, der Pseudo-Schön*; 246, 1927: *Ergänzungen und Berichtigungen des Sebald Beham-Kataloges Gustav Paulis*; 247, 1927: *Die Bilderbogen des Hans Sachs*). Max Geisberg published his large folio work with its about 1,600 plates: *Der Deutsche Einblatt-Holzschnitt in der ersten Hälfte des XVI. Jahrhunderts* (München, 1923-9) and (in 1929) started his complementary publication: *Die Deutsche Buchillustration in der ersten Hälfte des XVI. Jahrhunderts*. Hedwig Gollob wrote two books on Vienna woodcuts: *Systematisches beschreibendes Verzeichnis der mit Wiener Holzschnitten illustrierten Wiener Drucke vom Jahre 1460-1550*, Strassburg, 1925 (*Studien zur Deutschen Kunstgeschichte*, 232) and *Der Wiener Holzschnitt in den Jahren von 1490 bis 1550*, Wien, 1926 (*Artes Austriae*, 5). Hildegard Zimmermann and Erich von Rath devoted several articles to early woodcuts and engravings respectively. The *Bibliographie der Livres d'heures &c.* of the fifteenth and sixteenth century by Bohatta appeared in a second edition (Wien, 1924),<sup>1</sup> the *Versuch einer Zusammenstellung der Deutschen Volksbücher des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts nebst deren späteren Ausgaben und Literatur* was made by Paul Heitz and Fr. Ritter (Strassburg, 1924).

For books about books in more recent times two important works may be named beforehand: *Das französische Buch im achtzehnten Jahrhundert und in der Empirezeit*, the French literature of that period, the illustrators, the printers, booksellers and bookbinders, and the collecting of French books were described by Hans Fürstenberg, the collector, in the first annual gift 1929 for the members of the (Weimar) society of

<sup>1</sup> Bohatta in 1926 gave a survey on service printing in his booklet, *Liturgische Drucke und liturgische Drucker, Festschrift zum 100 jährigen Jubiläum des Verlags Friedrich Pustet, Regensburg*.



bibliophiles, and the *Deutsche Pressen* of the last decades were the object of a thorough bibliography by Julius Rodenberg. Typefounders in recent years have taken much interest in the history of their craft, especially D. Stempel at Frankfurt on the Main and Dr. Oscar Jolles<sup>1</sup> of the H. Berthold A.-G. in Berlin who died in 1928 and 1929 respectively. Friedrich Bauer's *Chronik der Schriftgiessereien in Deutschland und den deutschsprachigen Nachbarländern* appeared in a second edition in 1928. A Frankfurt exhibition of *Schriftproben deutscher Schriftgiessereien und Buchdruckereien aus den Jahren 1479 bis 1840* in 1926 was described by Gustav Mori. The *Bertholddrucke* contain bibliography: *Die deutsche Schriftgiesserei* (3, 1923, by Lothar von Biedermann) and researches into the history of typefounding in South Germany (4, 1924, by Gustav Mori), Vienna (5, 1924, by Georg Fritz), Königsberg (18, 1926, by myself) and Berlin (21, 1928, also by me) and publications concerning Unger (7, 1924, and—by Floboard von Biedermann—19, 1927) and Tauchnitz (8, 1924, by Heinrich Schwarz), the typefounder Schurig (20, 1928, by Friedrich Bauer) and the Campe-Fraktur (13, 1925, by me) and the lithographer Reuter (6, 1924, by Paul Hoffmann) and in reprint pamphlets of Breitkopf (11, 1925) and Göschen (14, 1925). Mori wrote on *Die Egenolff-Luthersche Schriftgiesserei in Frankfurt am Main und ihre geschäftlichen Verbindungen mit den Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika* (Frankfurt a. M., 1926) and Robert Diehl on *Beaumarchais als Nachfolger Baskervilles* (Frankfurt a. M., 1925). The growth of the Berlin book-trade up to 1825 was dealt with by Arthur Georgi in 1926; a history of printing there up to the sixties of the 19th century by August Potthast was published in the same year; a short survey from 1484 or 1540 to the present day with bibliography

<sup>1</sup> Cf. his article, 'Zur Geschichtsschreibung der Schriftgiesserei' in the *Archiv für Buchgewerbe und Gebrauchsgraphik*, 65, 1928.

was given by me in 1929. Wilhelm Dorn compiled a list of books and almanacs illustrated by the Berlin artist J. W. Meil in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century (*Meil-Bibliographie*, Berlin, 1928). The *Wandlungen des Leipziger Buchgeschmacks in den letzten hundert Jahren* were shown by Friedrich Schulze in 1926. Of monographs devoted to still existing firms of the book trade at least two may be named: *Das Bibliographische Institut, Festschrift zu seiner Jahrhundertfeier* by Johannes Hohlfeld, Leipzig, 1926, and *Fünfzig Jahre Reichsdruckerei 1879-1929*, Berlin, 1929, this with an introduction of mine on the history of official printing in Berlin.

As to bookbindings, there appeared in 1926 a second edition of Loubier's *Der Bucheinband von seinen Anfängen bis zum Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Monographien des Kunstgewerbes, 21. 22); in 1927 with Erhard Klette he started a *Jahrbuch der Einbandkunst*. In 1925 Husung edited a folio on the *Buchebände aus der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin in historischer Folge*; in 1929 Haebler and Ilse Schunke published *Rollen- und Plattenstempel des xvi. Jahrhunderts* (Sammlung bibliothekswissenschaftlicher Arbeiten, 41. 42). At the request of Dr. Johannes Hofmann, director of the City Library at Leipzig, since 1926 a commission of the Verein Deutscher Bibliothekare for cataloguing book-bindings is at work.<sup>1</sup>

The history of libraries has been dealt with by Alfred Hessel (*Geschichte der Bibliotheken*, Göttingen, 1925) and Walter Schürmeyer (*Bibliotheksräume aus fünf Jahrhunderten*, Frankfurt a. M., 1929), by Kurt Balcke (*Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek*, Leipzig, 1925 = *Mitteilungen aus der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek* 6) and Kurt Tautz (*Die Bibliothekare der churfürstlichen Bibliothek zu Cölln an der Spree*, Leipzig, 1925 = *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, Beiheft 53),

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the papers read and the reports given to the librarians' meetings at Vienna, Dortmund, and Königsberg by Dr. Hofmann in the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, 43, 1926, 44, 1927, and 46, 1929.

and Ernst Kuhnert (*Geschichte der Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek zu Königsberg von ihrer Begründung bis zum Jahre 1810*, Leipzig, 1926). Festschriften were published in honour of the librarians' meetings at Freiburg (1925), Vienna (1926), Dortmund (1927), Göttingen (1928), and Königsberg (1929).

Bibliography is a large country without recognized frontiers. Even more than with other things, there will be therefore no common opinion about what ought to be regarded as belonging to it and important for it. But whatever the one or the other may miss in the foregoing pages, I hope these will have shown how much is done for the cause of bibliography both in its narrower and in its wider sense in Germany and in Austria and also in German speaking Switzerland.

## SOME BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON MASSINGER

By A. K. McILWRAITH



O the student of Elizabethan dramatic publication the story of Massinger's relations with his printers may well seem tame and uneventful. There are no signs of piracy and few of defective manuscripts. Twelve of his acknowledged plays<sup>1</sup> were published in his lifetime, and of these all but the two in which he collaborated with another writer<sup>2</sup> bore dedications above his name; in most cases it is probable, too, from the number and nature of variants between copies in a single edition, that he actually supervised the printing. Even after his death good fortune followed him—at least until the end of the seventeenth century—for *The City-Madam* 'Printed for Andrew Pennycuicke, one of the Actors' in 1658 and 1659 seems to have been carefully printed by a competent workman from a prompt copy in the author's autograph, whatever we may think of Pennycuicke's ingenious scheme for multiplying dedication fees.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, the story has a few episodes of interest to the bibliographer.

The plays to which the highest bibliographical interest attaches are *The Virgin Martir*, 1622, *The Duke of Millaine*,

<sup>1</sup> I am not at present concerned with *Thierry and Theodoret*, 1621, *The Elder Brother*, 1637, or *The Bloody Brother*, 1639 and 1640, with which Massinger is connected only by internal evidence.

<sup>2</sup> *The Virgin Martir*, 1622, with Dekker, and *The Fatall Dowry*, 1632, with Field.

<sup>3</sup> I fear that in a note in *The Bodleian Quarterly Record* (v. 248-9) I exaggerated the novelty of the trick, which Pennycuicke had already practised in 1656 in dedicating *The Sun's-Darling*, a masque by Ford and Dekker, alternately to the Earl of Southampton and to the Earl of Kingston; see Bodleian copies Mal. 238(8) and Mal. 172(1).

1623, *The Picture*, 1630, and *The Maid of Honour*, 1632.<sup>1</sup> It so happens that the chronological order is also the order of ascending interest.

*The Virgin Martir*, 1622

*Title-page.* Two states of the title-page are known :

1) THE | VIRGIN | MARTIR, | A | TRAGEDIE. | AS IT  
HATH BIN DIVERS | times publickely Acted with great |  
Applause, | *By the seruants of his Maiesties Reuels.* | Written by  
*Phillip Messenger* and | *Thomas Decker.* | [*device, McKerrow,*  
*no. 299*] | LONDON, | Printed by *Bernard Alsop* for *Thomas* |  
*Iones.* 1622.

2) THE | VIRGIN | MARTIR, | A | TRAGEDIE. | AS IT  
HATH BIN DIVERS | times publickely Acted with great |  
Applause, | *By the seruants of his Maiesties Reuels.* | [*rule*] |  
Written {*Phillip Messenger* and } | [*rule*] | [*type ornament*] | [*rule*] |  
by {*Thomas Deker.* }

LONDON, | Printed by *B. A.* for *Thomas* | *Iones.* 1622.

*Collation.* 4<sup>o</sup>: A<sup>1</sup>, B-L<sup>4</sup>, M<sup>2</sup>. Copies collated, eight.

The most striking difference between the states is that one has the printer's device and his full name, while the other has only a type ornament and his initials. The Editor suggests to me that the former was intended to be used in a part of the edition which the printer meant to sell himself, the copies which he took for disposal in this way being perhaps part of the payment for his work. This explanation seems highly probable, and I accept it with gratitude.

It is not a matter of great intrinsic importance which state was printed first. One has the spelling 'Decker' and the other 'Deker'; the author's own spelling seems to have been

<sup>1</sup> I have discussed elsewhere (*R. E. S.*, v. 36-42) the suspicious features of *The Emperour of the East*, 1632.

'Dekker', but 'Decker' was a common variant, which 'Deker', to the best of my knowledge, was not, and one might be tempted to surmise from this that the 'Deker' state was the original and the 'Decker' state a correction. There is, however, some interesting evidence to the contrary. It is not possible to fix the order by means of other variants in the same forme, since sig. A is a single leaf,<sup>1</sup> but there is a variant reading on its verso,<sup>2</sup> and the earlier state is found in a 'Decker' copy. This is significant, for the distribution of corrected and uncorrected states of the text in the copies of this edition is generally consistent. In the following table (which is based on deliberate corrections only, neglecting accidental disturbances) each Clarendon letter represents one of the copies collated: <sup>3</sup>

Forme	Uncorrected State	Corrected State	Missing
A (outer)	AB	CDFGH	E
A (inner)	B	ACDFGH	E
B (outer)	AB	CDEFGH	—
C (outer)	AB	CDEFGH	—
E (inner)	AB	CDEFGH	—
F (outer)	ABE	CDFGH	—
I (inner)	AB	CDEFGH	—
L (inner)	F <sup>4</sup>	ABCDEGH	—
M (outer)	E	ABCDFGH	—

<sup>1</sup> Contrast the case of *The Picture*, below, pp. 83-4.

<sup>2</sup> 'The Actors nomes.' corrected to 'The Actors names'.

<sup>3</sup> It seems unnecessary to specify the particular copy in every case. I do not think that in any of the formes in this list (with the single exception mentioned in the next note) there is any real doubt that the variants arise from deliberate corrections at the press, and not from accidental corruptions. A complete list of the variant readings, which are numerous and generally trivial, would be out of place here.

<sup>4</sup> The only variant in inner L is that F (Dyce 6321, the Mitford copy) has the running title on L4<sup>r</sup> upside down, and this may be the result of an accident at the press.

The accepted view of modern bibliography is that it was a matter of pure chance whether a book which had the corrected state of one forme had the corrected or uncorrected state of another, but surely such a degree of uniformity as this—and we shall find the same thing in *The Picture*—implies in books where it is found a regular procedure in the printing, drying, and perfecting of sheets and their collection for binding. Dr. McKerrow's doubtful admission of the possibility that 'a few sheets in the most correct state might be selected to be made up into presentation copies for the author's friends'<sup>1</sup> does not meet the case, for what we find is not a few copies which are *correct* in all formes, but one or two which are *incorrect* throughout. After all, is there anything strange in the adoption of a regular procedure? As the first forme was being printed off the sheets had normally to be hung out to dry somehow, and if they were always hung in about the same order there would be the advantage that when the printer began to perfect he could begin with the sheets that had had longest to dry and work on through. I am less surprised by the apparent fact that in a few cases a regular procedure was followed than by the evident fact that in most cases it was not.

It is therefore probable that the 'Deker' state is the later, and the unusual spelling of the name must have been introduced either inadvertently or, perhaps, in an unsuccessful attempt to get 'Decker' altered to the author's own spelling 'Dekker'.

*The Duke of Millaine, 1623*

4<sup>0</sup>: [A]<sup>2</sup>, [π]<sup>2</sup>, B-M<sup>4</sup>. A1<sup>r</sup>, title; A1<sup>v</sup>, blank; A2<sup>r</sup>, dedication; A2<sup>v</sup>, *dramatis personae*; π1<sup>r</sup>, commendatory verses;<sup>2</sup> π2<sup>r</sup>, blank (frequently missing); B1<sup>r</sup>, the play. Copies collated eleven.

This was the first of Massinger's plays to appear in print with

<sup>1</sup> R. B. McKerrow, *Introduction to Bibliography*, p. 209.

<sup>2</sup> They are signed 'W.B.' I have suggested (*R.E.S.*, iv. 326-7) that the initials probably stand for the name of William Bagnall.

a dedication from his own hand, and there are, in the text, in the collation, and in the make-up, several signs of confusion perhaps arising from the author's inexperience.

I. *Textual*. At two points in the text the printer has conscientiously left a blank space for a word which he could not decipher (iv. iii. 98, 169,<sup>1</sup> sigs. I4<sup>v</sup>, K1<sup>v</sup>) and elsewhere marginal corrections in the manuscript have been reproduced in the margin in italics as though they were stage-directions (iii. ii. 97, iii. iii. 45, sigs. G4<sup>r</sup>, H1<sup>v</sup>).

II. *Collation*. The commendatory verses were added, apparently as an afterthought, on a separate half sheet,<sup>2</sup> and are missing from several copies. It is suggestive that verses over the same signature prefixed to *The Bond-man* in the following year commence

*The PRINTERS haste calls on; I must not driue  
My time past Sixe, though I begin at Fiue.*

*The Bond-Man, 1624, sig. A4<sup>r</sup>.*

Perhaps the verses for *The Duke of Millaine* arrived too late to be included in the same sheet as the title and dedication.

III. *Make-up*. In all copies but one (Bodleian Library, Mal. 236(1)) the text has been more or less seriously mutilated at the foot of sigs. B1<sup>r</sup> and B1<sup>v</sup> through being cut into by the binder.<sup>3</sup> It has not been observed that the reason for this is that sheet B has an abnormally large number of lines to the page. Not counting the running title, the number of lines to the full page in sheets C to M is 35 followed by the catchword on a fresh line, except in four cases (sigs. G1<sup>v</sup>, G3<sup>v</sup>, H3<sup>v</sup>, H4<sup>v</sup>)

<sup>1</sup> The numbering of the lines is that of the complete edition of Massinger upon whose preparation I am engaged. It counts the lines of verse, not of type; but where prose occurs it counts, for the present, the lines of type in the quarto. I find that in general it agrees closely with the numbering used by Boyle and A. H. Cruickshank.

<sup>2</sup> See *The Review of English Studies*, iv. 326, note †.

<sup>3</sup> Compare the observations of Dr. W. W. Greg, 4 *The Library*, v. 61, and of Professor T. W. Baldwin in his edition of the play, p. 1, n. 1.



where the catchword is level with the last line of the text, and one (sig. H4<sup>r</sup>) where it is omitted; on these five pages the number of lines is 36. In sheet B the six pages B2<sup>r</sup> to B4<sup>v</sup> each contain 36 lines of text with the catchword on a fresh line below it, while sig. B1<sup>v</sup> has 37 lines and the catchword level with the last. The head ornament and act heading make it impossible to count the lines in sig. B1<sup>r</sup>, but the type page is of the same size as in sig. B1<sup>v</sup>. Sheet B thus contains ten lines more than normal. It is improbable that a printer would set the first sheet with a standard of 36 lines to the page and then reduce it to 35 for the other sheets, and this raises the suspicion that sheet B may be a cancel issued to make good some serious omission in the original printing. There is nothing to indicate what the omission may have been, and it need not have been precisely ten lines, for a further saving of space could have been made over the head ornament and title at sig. B1<sup>r</sup>. This hypothetical cancelled state of sheet B is not preserved in any copy known to me, and it may never have existed, but the crowding of sheet B is suspicious, and the other irregularities in the quarto show that Massinger sent the printer a difficult manuscript and failed to exercise that strict supervision over the printing which he later found to be advisable.

*The Picture, 1630*

I. Title-page. II. Running title. III. Cancel.

I. *Title-page.* As in *The Virgin Martir, 1622*, there are two states of the title-page.

(1) THE | PICTURE | A TRAGÆ-COMÆDIE, | As it was often presented with good | allowance, at the *Globe*, and | *Blackefriers* play-houses, by | the Kings Maiesties | seruants. | [rule] | Written by Philip Massinger. | [rule] | [device, McKerrow, no. 269] | [rule] | LONDON. | Printed by I. N. for Thomas Walkley and are | to be sould at his shoppe at the *Eagle* and | *Child in Brittaines Burse.* 1630.

(2) THE | PICTVRE. | A | TRAGECOMEDIE, | As it was often presented with good | allowance, at the *Globe*, and *Blacke- | Friers Play-houses*, by the Kings | Maiesties seruants. | [*etc., as in first state.*] 4<sup>o</sup>: A-M<sup>4</sup>, N<sup>2</sup>. Copies collated, eleven.

In this play the title is on sig. A2<sup>r</sup>, (A1 being blank and often missing,) and the order of the states is fixed by the correction of two misprints elsewhere in the same forme.<sup>1</sup> I do not see why the title-page was partly re-set, but the author was probably not responsible, for his press-corrections in other plays show that he preferred 'comedy' and 'tragedy' spelt with an 'æ' diphthong, the spelling which was here abandoned.<sup>2</sup>

As in *The Virgin Martir* there is clear evidence of systematic procedure in the printing, drying, perfecting, and assembling of the sheets:

Forme	Uncorrected State	Corrected State	Missing
A (outer)	B	ACDEFHIX	GK
A (inner)	B	ACDEFHIX	GK
C (outer)	BX	ACDEFGHIK	—
C (inner)	BX	ACDEFGHIK	—
L (inner)	BX	ACDEFGHIK	—
M (outer)	B	ACDEFGHIKX	—
N (outer)	ABCDEFGHIKX	G	—

It is unnecessary to repeat the arguments already advanced.<sup>3</sup>

II. *Running titles.* These have two points of interest. In setting these forth it will be convenient to disregard sheet I in the Gosse copy, which is, as explained below, a cancel, and so stands in no organic relation to the rest of the book.

<sup>1</sup> Sig. A3<sup>v</sup>, dedication l. 23, 'uothing' corrected to 'nothing', and sig. A4<sup>r</sup>, Jay's verses l. 1, 'thinges' corrected to 'thinkes'.

<sup>2</sup> An -e- spelling was altered at the press to and -æ- spelling in *The Duke of Millaine*, 1623, sig. A1<sup>r</sup>, and *The Maid of Honour*, 1632, sig. B1<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> B = Bodleian Library, Mal. 236(6), G = Cambridge University Library, Syn. 7. 63. 19, X = Gosse copy. The only variant in sheet N is at v. iii. 215 (sig. N2<sup>v</sup>) 'abiure' corrected to 'abiure'.

(1) In sheets B to K the running title is in large type; there are thirty-six lines of text to the full page in sheets B to I and thirty-eight lines in sheet K. In sheets L to N the running title is in small type, and there are thirty-nine lines to the page. In these two and a half sheets (L1<sup>r</sup> to N2<sup>v</sup>) the printer has thus saved nineteen lines.<sup>1</sup> Sig. N2<sup>v</sup> contains thirty-four lines of text, so that if he had carried on from sheet K with large type for the running title and a maximum of thirty-eight lines to the page he would have had fifteen lines left over after filling sig. N2<sup>v</sup>, and would have been forced to use a full sheet instead of a half. This economy must have been the motive of the change. It would seem that the printer might in fact have followed a uniform style throughout, and have used the blank leaf A1 (which is cut off in most copies) for the extra fifteen lines,<sup>2</sup> but his decision had to be taken when he had just finished sheet K, and if the preliminaries were, as usual, printed last, he very likely did not then know that the blank leaf would be available.

(2) The printer set up at least three sets of small-type running titles for sheets L, M, and N, each set sufficient for the four pages of a forme. These sets were composed as follows:

set α has all four correct,	<i>The Picture.</i>
set β has one correct,	<i>The Picture.</i>
and three incorrect,	<i>The Picture-</i>
	<i>The Picturc.</i>
	<i>The Pictnre.</i>
set γ has two correct,	<i>The Picture.</i>
and two incorrect,	<i>The Picture.</i>
	<i>The Picture.</i>

Clearly the printer may have had two correct sets (α), but it is

<sup>1</sup> Potentially twenty, but sig. N2<sup>v</sup> was not full.

<sup>2</sup> A common form of economy. There is a probable instance in *The Great Duke of Florence*, 1636, where in thirteen copies out of fourteen collated the coincidence of watermarks and chain lines suggests strongly that the final leaf signed L is in fact the missing A1, and is conjugate with A4.

equally clear that he would hardly have duplicated the eccentric combinations of errors exhibited in  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ .

Each set was kept together and not split up,<sup>1</sup> and when a forme was corrected at the press it received a different set of running titles in its second state (except in outer N, where, as we have seen, the correction does not fall into line with those in the rest of the play.) The sets of running titles are distributed as follows over the formes of these two and a half sheets :

inner L, first state	.	.	.	$\alpha$
inner L, second state	.	.	.	$\gamma$
outer L, only state	.	.	.	$\beta$
inner M, only state	.	.	.	$\alpha$
outer M, first state	.	.	.	$\beta$
outer M, second state	.	.	.	$\gamma$
inner N, only state	.	.	.	$\beta$ (part)
outer N, both states	.	.	.	$\beta$ (rest)

I do not know of any parallel to this shuffling about of the running titles, and none of the hypotheses that I have tried completely explains it. Speculation is very tempting but the evidence is insufficient, for the number of consecutive sheets is too small, and there are too few formes in which two states have been found. The first difficulty is inherent in the position of the sheets in question ; the second may disappear as further copies are examined, or collateral evidence may be forthcoming from other books printed by the second John Norton.

III. *Cancel*. In one copy<sup>2</sup> sheet I is from a different setting of type throughout. The running title is in a fresh fount, intermediate in size between the large type used elsewhere in sheets B to K and the small type used to economize space in sheets

<sup>1</sup> They were not left standing in the chase, for the members change their relative positions within each set.

<sup>2</sup> That which belonged to the late Sir Edmund Gosse. I am most grateful to Mr. T. J. Wise for having afforded me an opportunity to collate the Gosse copies of Massinger's plays whilst they were for a time in his charge.

L to N. The fount used for the text appears to be the same as in the rest of the play (though I should be sorry to speak with too great an appearance of conviction on this point), and the two settings agree with one another page for page and line for line, but the composition and press-work are both unusually careless in the Gosse copy of this sheet. We must conclude, I think, that the common setting of sheet I (found in ten copies) is the original one, and that that in the Gosse copy is a hasty reprint.

Neither setting contains any serious fault (such as we shall find in the first setting of sheet K of *The Maid of Honour*) which would account for the reprinting of the sheet, though they differ in some two hundred places in spelling, punctuation, and the accidental misuse of italics. It is perhaps significant that if Dr. Greg's theory is correct the copy in which the reprint is found was one of 'a collection of his works made by Massinger, presumably for some friend or patron, in 1632-3'.<sup>1</sup> Did the publisher find, when a copy was wanted two or three years after the play was printed, that some accident had destroyed his stock of sheet I, so that it had to be reprinted to make his remaining stock of the other sheets marketable? No other explanation presents itself, and a comparison with the case of *The Maid of Honour* supports the suggestion that the reprint here was some time later than the original issue. There the original printing was spoiled at the press and had to be replaced at once, so that few copies of it got into circulation and it is found in only two copies out of seventeen; here, on my view, the edition had been on the market for a year or two before the reprint was needed, and the original setting is found in ten copies out of eleven.

*The Maid of Honour*, 1632

4<sup>o</sup>: [A]<sup>2</sup>, B-L<sup>4</sup> [A<sup>2</sup> signed in error B<sup>2</sup>]. Copies collated, seventeen.

I. Distribution of work between compositors. II. Cancel.

<sup>1</sup> *The Library*, 4th ser., v. 61.

I. *Distribution of work between compositors.* There is considerable inconsistency in the quarto's treatment of scene headings, stage directions, and speech prefixes; a study of the variations in these respects shows that two compositors were engaged upon the work, neither of them wholly self-consistent, but each with a recognizable practice differing from that of his fellow.

(i) In scene headings, one compositor (who may be called  $\alpha$ ) places a full stop after each name, as in iv. iv.

A Flourish.

*Pierio. Roderigo. Iacomo. Gonzaga. Aurelia. Ferdinand.  
Astutio. Attendants.*

From this rule  $\alpha$  never departs. The practice of the other compositor ( $\beta$ ) is to separate the names by commas, as in II. i. '*Roberto, Fulgentio, Astutio.*' From this rule  $\beta$  departs whenever he has to do with a descriptive heading calling for fuller punctuation, as in II. iii.

The chambers discharg'd : A flourish, as to an assault. *Gonzaga, Pierio, Roderigo, Iacomo, Souldiers.*

(though in such cases the names themselves are still generally separated by commas), and he also forsakes it for  $\alpha$ 's practice once in sig. E2<sup>v</sup>, II. iv scene heading.

(ii) In stage directions,  $\alpha$  prints the whole in italics, as in I. i. 4, '*Enter Fulgent.*', I. i. 36, '*Enter Bertoldo. Gasparo. Anthonio. a servant.*' From this practice  $\alpha$  never departs in ordinary stage directions, but he thrice uses roman in scene headings (as in iv. iv, quoted above).  $\beta$ 's normal practice in simple directions is to print proper names in italics and other words in Roman, as in I. i. 270, '*Exeunt Roberto, Fulgentio, Astutio attendants.*' To this rule he adheres strictly in the case of directions comprising only the word 'Enter' or 'Exit' and proper names, but in more elaborate ones he is not consistent. He prints 'attendants' in Roman in the direction

quoted above, but at III. iii. 15 he prints 'Exeunt Sylli, Clarinda, Servants.' At I. ii. 6 he prints 'Sylli walking by, and practising his postures.' But at III. iii. 17 he prints 'Enter Adorni wounded.' At IV. iv. 57 he prints 'Ferdinand [read Bertoldo] kneeling, kisses her hand.' And where a direction does not contain any proper name, he uses italics throughout (e.g. V. i. 24 'Kisses her shoos often.').

(iii) In abbreviating the names in speech prefixes neither compositor is quite consistent, but in the names of Bertoldo, Fulgentio, and Sylli, where the difference between the compositors is most clearly defined,  $\alpha$  prints *Ber.* (but *Bert.* once and *Bertol.* twice), *Fulgen.* (but *Ful.* once in a crowded line), and *Syl.* (but *Sylli.* once, and further variants where he is reprinting  $\beta$ 's work in sheet K, on which see below, pp. 91-2).  $\beta$  is rather less consistent, but he prints *Bertol.* usually (with a single lapse to *Bert.* in a crowded line and four expansions to the full name), *Fulg.* most commonly (but *Fulgen.* once, *Fulgent.* four times, and the full name three times), and *Sylli.* (with *Syll.* once).<sup>1</sup>

These criteria supplement and confirm one another, and by their means the play (apart from the preliminary matter) may be divided between the two compositors as follows:

B1 <sup>r</sup> -B2 <sup>v</sup> . $\alpha$	E3 <sup>v</sup> -E4 <sup>v</sup> . $\alpha$	I1 <sup>r</sup> -I2 <sup>v</sup> . $\beta$
B3 <sup>r</sup> -B4 <sup>v</sup> . $\beta$	F1 <sup>r</sup> -F2 <sup>v</sup> . $\beta$	I3 <sup>r</sup> -I4 <sup>v</sup> . $\alpha$
C1 <sup>r</sup> -C2 <sup>v</sup> . $\beta$	F3 <sup>r</sup> -F4 <sup>v</sup> . $\alpha$	K1 <sup>r</sup> -K2 <sup>v</sup> . (1) $\beta$ , (2) $\alpha^3$
C3 <sup>r</sup> -C4 <sup>v</sup> . $\alpha$	G1 <sup>r</sup> -G2 <sup>v2</sup> . $\beta$	K3 <sup>r</sup> -K4 <sup>v</sup> . (1) $\alpha$ , (2) $\alpha^3$
D1 <sup>r</sup> -D2 <sup>v</sup> . $\beta$	G2 <sup>v2</sup> -G4 <sup>v</sup> . $\alpha$	L1 <sup>r</sup> -L2 <sup>v</sup> . $\beta$
D3 <sup>r</sup> -D4 <sup>v</sup> . $\alpha$	H1 <sup>r</sup> -H2 <sup>v</sup> . $\beta$	L3 <sup>r</sup> -L4 <sup>v</sup> . $\alpha$
E1 <sup>r</sup> -E3 <sup>r</sup> . $\beta$	H3 <sup>r</sup> -H4 <sup>v</sup> . $\alpha$	

<sup>1</sup> It would be useless to give line-references for the exceptions in the absence of an accessible edition of the text with numbered lines; the statements have been carefully checked.

<sup>2</sup> Each compositor set up a part of sig. G2<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> On the reprinting of sheet K see below, pp. 91-2.

Once this division is made, it is further confirmed by two additional criteria. (iv) The quarto follows the normal practice of beginning each speech on a fresh line: this rule is broken forty-five times by  $\alpha$  and only five times by  $\beta$ . (v) A short speech comprising parts of two verse lines is usually given two lines of type:  $\alpha$  runs it into one twice only, and  $\beta$  eight times.

It will be seen that the body of the work is divided into half-sheet units. Only twice are these limits broken.  $E3^r$  is associated with  $E1^r-E2^v$  by a stage direction in  $\beta$ 's form (II. iv. 22 'Enter Souldier.')

<sup>1</sup> And in  $G2^v$  a stage direction in  $\beta$ 's form is immediately followed by one in  $\alpha$ 's (III. iii. 96 'Eexeunt [read Exit!] Servant.' III. iii. 99 'Enter Anthonio. Gasparo. Serv.')

The first of these is good evidence that  $\beta$  set up  $E3^r$  as well as  $E1^r-E2^v$ ; the second, owing to the comparative irregularity of  $\beta$ 's habits, is not quite such good evidence that he stopped five lines short of the end of sig.  $G2^v$ . Further it is clear that except at one point these half-sheet units were taken by alternate compositors.  $\alpha$  took the first, then  $\beta$  took two in succession, and then from the middle of sheet C to the end  $\beta$  set up the first four pages of each sheet and  $\alpha$  the second four.

Readers of *The Library* will recollect that in 1921 Dr. McKerrow argued<sup>2</sup> that a pair of type-cases in Elizabethan times would probably hold enough type for 'at least three and not more than five ordinary quarto pages', that each compositor 'might have the use of only two or three pairs of cases, at most, of a particular fount', and that 'There would accordingly be nothing surprising if in a piece of Elizabethan printing we found indication of two different compositors setting alternate groups of some four to twelve pages.' This is clearly just such a case as Dr. McKerrow envisaged, but unless I am

<sup>1</sup> It may be noted that sig.  $E2^v$  has a scene-heading in  $\alpha$ 's form, II. iv. 'Fer-  
dinand Druso. Livio. above.'

<sup>2</sup> *The Library*, 4th ser., II. 107 sq.



mistaken not many clear examples have been recorded, and I find no reference to the question in his *Introduction to Bibliography* (1927). In the meantime it has been shown by Mr. Percy Simpson and Mr. G. W. Wheeler<sup>1</sup> that the normal rate of composition at this time was one sheet a day, and we may perhaps see a special significance in the choice of four-page, or half-sheet, units: on the day that any sheet, say H, was being printed off, may we suppose that  $\beta$  spent the morning in setting up  $I1^r-I2^v$  and the afternoon in distributing the type of  $G1^r-G2^v$ , while  $\alpha$  spent the morning in distributing the type of  $G3^r-G4^v$  and the afternoon in setting up  $I3^r-I4^v$  (since we must assume that each compositor was responsible for distributing the type which he had set up<sup>2</sup>)?

II. *Cancel*. The reprinting of sheet K (to which I have several times referred) is an interesting result of an error in perfecting. Casual errors in perfecting are not uncommon in seventeenth-century printing, and they are several times found in individual copies of Massinger's plays with no accompanying textual variants. In these cases the printer probably fixed one sheet to the tympan with the wrong edge up. In the present play, the error in perfecting sheet K occurs in two copies;<sup>3</sup> in these the pages run [1-6-7-4-5-2-3-8]. All the other copies collated, fifteen in number, are from a different setting of type, and are correctly perfected with their pages in the right order. The re-setting of the type is abundantly proved by the large number of differences in spelling, punctuation, fount of punctuation marks, and in the use of plain or swash italic capitals. It would seem that the error in perfecting spoiled the whole of the original impression (perhaps because the forme was placed

<sup>1</sup> *Oxford Bibliographical Society Proceedings & Papers*, ii. 16-17, 25-8.

<sup>2</sup> R. B. McKerrow, *Introduction to Bibliography*, p. 24.

<sup>3</sup> Bodleian Library, Mal. 178(6) and Mal. 236(8); the Bodleian has recently acquired two other copies, Mal. Q. 21 and Mal. Q. 22, containing the cancel of sheet K in different stages of correction.

wrong-way-round on the bed of the press) and that it was not noticed until the type had been distributed and some few copies had gone to the binder.<sup>1</sup>

The cancel was evidently set up throughout by *a.* The second half of the sheet had fallen to him originally. In the first half, the original version has all *β*'s characteristics, while the cancel has *α*'s. The scene heading of v. i has a full stop replacing a comma, stage directions are altered from the form (iv. v. 85) 'Exit *Fulgentio.*' to 'Exit *Fulgen.*', and the speech prefixes are altered from *Rober.* or *Roberto.* and *Sylli.* to *Rob.* and *Syl.* (normally; but at two places in the first half of the sheet *a* followed copy with the full form, and he even carried over *Syll.* or *Sylli.* into the second half in two places where he had originally printed *Syl.*)

\* \* \* \* \*

In these rather disjointed notes I have tried, for the most part, to present Massingerian material which throws some light on questions of general bibliographical interest, but I hope I may be excused if I have smuggled in one or two particular problems which have baffled me, in the hope that they may be solved by some one more experienced than myself.

<sup>1</sup> In her edition of the play (London, 1927, p. xlviii), Miss E. A. W. Bryne suggests that the forme must have been placed the wrong way round on the bed of the press; she does not, however, draw the obvious inference, but regards the cancel as the original setting.

## THE BEGINNINGS OF PRINTING IN ABYSSINIA

By STEPHEN GASELEE



**E**THIOPIA printing began in the West with the *Psalterium Chaldaicum sive potius Aethiopicum*, edited by Johann Potken, provost of the Church of St. George at Cologne, and printed by Marcellus Silber, successor to the early printer Eucharius Silber, on 10 September 1513 at Rome. An investigation of Ethiopic typography would form part of a general work on the use of Oriental types in Europe, which I hope will some day be written, and the present article is a sketch of printing in Abyssinia alone.

The printer of Ethiopic or Amharic is confronted with the initial difficulty of requiring a large number of 'sorts'. The form of each letter varies in seven different ways according to the vowel which follows it, with the result that, strictly speaking, the language is written by means of a syllabary rather than an alphabet. There are in Ethiopic proper 26 letters, which thus exist in 182 varieties: Amharic has 7 more letters, producing 49 more varieties: there are about 20 ligatures or diphthongs, 4 forms of punctuation, and about 30 numerals. The printer must therefore start with nearly 300 characters.

The first printing-press with Amharic types seems to have belonged to missionaries in Massawah; but as that is now within the Italian colony of Eritrea, it is better to look to Abyssinia itself. In 1900 the French Franciscan, Father Marie-Barnard, opened a hostel for lepers at Harar: and in order to keep his European supporters informed, he used to produce for them a little magazine or mission-paper, of which he multiplied copies on a roneograph or one of those gelatine apparatuses we used to employ with varying success. In 1905 he bought a

little printing-press from the French firm of Raguenot, and procured a fount of Amharic type; he not only printed the mission-sheet, *Le Semeur d'Éthiopie*, for his subscribers, but turned an honest penny by the production of visiting-cards, business envelopes, notices, and commercial printing generally for the European colony, much of it being in Amharic. He visited Europe in 1909, bringing back with him several technical improvements for his press, and about the same time moved it to the now growing town of Dire-Dawa. Thus it continued until 1914 when, the French monks abroad being called to the colours, the *Semeur d'Éthiopie* ceased publication, but the press at Dire-Dawa continued its commercial work.

A Greek, meanwhile, named Kavadia (the Greeks were always the pioneers of foreign commerce and industry in Abyssinia) started in the capital, Addis Ababa, a little Amharic periodical, *Aimro* (Intelligence), of which he used to make twenty-four copies on a multiplying machine. The Emperor Menelik took some interest in this enterprise, and obtained for him a small printing-press from Europe: Kavadia had financial difficulties which prevented him from making use of this for some years, and it was employed at first only to print governmental decrees, but in 1914 Kavadia revived the *Aimro* on this press, and it continued for a year or two, until political troubles made it come to an end. But the press continued to be worked, several of the workmen coming from the mission press at Dire-Dawa described above, and in 1924 the *Aimro* once more appeared, still under the editorship of Kavadia. During the war an Allied bulletin 'News from the War' also appeared in Addis Ababa, and in 1917 the present foreign minister, Belatengheta Herui, brought out a few numbers of a weekly literary review, *Goba-Tsabab* (the dawn).

In 1920 a second Amharic press was instituted at Addis Ababa, by the initiative and at the expense of the Negus Tafari Makonnen, now the Emperor Haile Selassie. This is

now in full work, and prints notices and circulars for the European Diplomatic Missions; it is on rather a larger scale than the other press, and possesses zincographic and book-binding departments. At it, since 1923, there has been printed a weekly newspaper called *Brhanasalam* (Light and Peace): it is said that the circulation of these two journals is 300 and 500 copies respectively.

A passing mention may also be made of a hand-press, belonging to a French printer named Desvages. This exists primarily to produce a French journal, the *Courrier d'Éthiopie*, but it possesses also a small fount of Amharic type, for occasional passages in the *Courrier*, with which a few advertisements, &c., are from time to time printed.

The Emperor's press is much the most important as regards the output of books—the only one indeed that has produced works of any length, and its present achievements may be judged by the following translation of a catalogue issued by it in the middle of 1929. The prices are in Abyssinian dollars.

	\$
Psalms of David (pocket edition, bound)	2
The books of Solomon and Siracides (Ge'ez <sup>1</sup> and Amharic)	7
Ezekiel (Ge'ez and Amharic)	7
The four Gospels (Ge'ez and Amharic)	10
Christ's teaching to his disciples (Ge'ez and Amharic)	2
The book of St. John Afu-Worq <sup>2</sup> (Ge'ez and Amharic)	12
The 14 Sacred Songs (Ge'ez and Amharic)	10
The 14 Sacred Songs with literal translation and commentary	5
The book of Mar-Yisahaq (Ge'ez and Amharic)	12
The praise of St. Mary	3
The Sacred Songs of St. Mary	2
The visit of H.H. Princess Manen to Jerusalem	0.50
The visit of H.I.H. Taffari Makonnen to Aden	0.50
'My heart is my friend'	1
The book of administration	1
Biographies	2.50
Goha-Sibah (twilight)	5

<sup>1</sup> Ethiopic.

<sup>2</sup> 'Golden-mouth'—i. e. Chrysostom.

Arithmetic . . . . .	8
Amharic grammar . . . . .	1
Ancient and modern poetry . . . . .	1
Thoughts and wishes . . . . .	0·25
Book for teaching small children . . . . .	0·25
Poetry . . . . .	0·20
'Happiness and honour,' or the visit of H.I.H. Taffari to Europe . . . . .	9
Geography of the world (bound) . . . . .	6
Brief history of the world . . . . .	0·50
Proverbs . . . . .	1
A strong fortress . . . . .	
The doctrine of Christianity . . . . .	
Instruction in the Galla language . . . . .	

[The Catalogue does not give the prices of the last three, as they were printed at the royal press for the Swedish evangelical Mission, whose property they are, and whence they can be obtained.] There is a fairly complete collection of these books at the British Museum, the Bodleian Library, and the University Library, Cambridge.

Since the issue of this catalogue, one more book of importance has appeared. It is by Belatengheta Herui mentioned above, is entitled *Wazeima*,<sup>1</sup> and contains valuable historical and chronological matter—accounts of the patriarchs of Alexandria, the Abunas of Abyssinia, and the Kings of Abyssinia. It is now being translated in this country, and it is hoped that some account of its contents may appear in some journal interested in the History of the Ethiopian Church and State.

For particulars of the early Mission press I am indebted to an article in no. 9 of the *Aethiopien-Korrespondenz* (1928), printed in Hanover but also published at Addis Ababa. The article being signed *W.*, I imagine that it was from the pen of the editor of this journal, Dr. Erich Weininger.

<sup>1</sup> 'The chant at the Vigil before the Feast'—the suggestion is that the Emperor is inaugurating a time of rejoicing and prosperity, and that the unlettered people should study the history of their own land.

## KEEP THE WIDOW WAKING

By G. B. HARRISON



IN June and September 1927 Professor Charles Sisson published in the *Library* the amazing story of Mrs. Anne Elsdon whose misadventures not only caused a long series of legal proceedings in 1624 but also inspired a ballad and a play called *Keep the Widow Waking*. The play is lost, but Professor Sisson found the ballad which is ribald and rollicking. Mrs. Elsdon, however, was not the first widow to be so served and apparently the phrase 'Keep the widow waking' was popular at least thirty years before.

In the early months of 1595 the doings of a certain notorious cozenor, Judith Phillips, *alias* Doll Phillips, *alias* Doll Pope, caused a deal of unseemly amusement, insomuch that no less than four pamphlets and at least one ballad were published. They were :

1. *The Brideling, Sadling and Ryding, of a rich Churle in Hampshire, by the subtile practice of one Iudeth Philips, a professed cunning woman, or Fortune teller. With a true discourse of her unwomanly vsing of a Trypewife, a widow, lately dwelling on the back side of S. Nicholas shambles in London, whom she with her confederates, likewise cosoned.*

The only copy surviving is in the Huntington Library and I have been unable to see it ; for the full title I am indebted to a note in Professor C. R. Baskervill's *Elizabethan Jig*, p. 72. Such a story of bridling, however, is to be found in Chettle's *Kind-hart's Dreame*, 1592.

2. *A quest of Enquirie,  
By Women to know,  
Whether the Tripe-wife were trimmed  
by Doll yea or no.*

*Gathered by Oliuer Oat-meale.*

The only copy is in the Clausen Library but a reprint is included in A. B. Grosart's *Elizabethan England in Gentle and Simple life*, 1881. Quotations in the present article are taken from Grosart.

Three others, all lost, were entered on 25 February 1595 :

3. *A trew Discoverye of ij notable villanyes practised by one Judith Phillips the wyfe of John Phillips of Crowne Alleye in Bishopsgate strete.*
4. *The notorious cousenages of Dorotheie Phillips otherwise called Doll Pope ;*
5. A ballad thereof. (*Arber's Reprint*, ii. 672).
6. There is also a note of the depositions of Doll, her husband, and one of her confederates in the *Salisbury Manuscripts* (vol. v, pp. 81-3), dated 10 January 1595.

Oliver Oatmeal, like others of his generation, is somewhat allusive, but, from his account and the more sober but not less astonishing depositions, the main outline of the story can be reconstructed.

There was a certain widow called Mrs. Mescall, aged about sixty years, who pursued the vocation of tripe-wife. She had jewellery, money, and property of some value, and was therefore, after the fate of Elizabethan widows, the prey of fortune-hunters. However, the old woman was shrewd, if not over-virtuous, and very careful not to commit herself to any promise of marriage. Her wooers being thus nonplussed called in the professional services of Doll Phillips.

The two chief confederates were named Peters and Vaughan ; Peters was to be the husband. Accordingly they told Doll



many details of the widow's life and suitors so that she might be well primed. She was also provided by Vaughan with a letter of introduction, purporting to come from a respectable friend of the widow's, a Mr. Grace, wherein Doll was commended to her as one who might do her great good. Doll therefore called on the widow with the letter, was well entertained, and invited to come into the house.

After some conversation, Doll looked into the widow's hand and began to describe her suitors ; then she asked whether the widow was not troubled in the night with sights and noises in her house. The widow admitted it.

'Yes,' added Doll, 'hath there not been lights seen in your house ?'

'How know you that ?' said the widow.

'I know it well,' answered Doll, 'and the cause too ; for there is money hid in your house.'

By this time the widow, having formed a high opinion of Doll's skill, put the difficult question—who would be her husband ; she had most fancy to marry an old gentleman that was very rich and a suitor to her, but she would not marry with him until she knew 'when the world would turn'.

This cryptic remark carried Doll out of her part, so she put off an answer by saying that she would come again. Meanwhile she would get the hidden money. She therefore told the widow that she must have as much gold as she had, which she would not carry away but would leave in the house ; and within two days the hidden gold should come to the place where the other gold was laid. The widow produced some gold, a gold chain, seven rings, and a whistle, put them in a purse and gave them to Doll. Doll wrapped the purse in yarn and apparently handed it back to the widow, but actually substituted a similar package which contained two stones ; this parcel the widow took and hid, being strictly charged not to look at it for three days. Doll also demanded a turkey and a capon as an offering

for the Queen of the Fairies. After causing the widow to offer prayers in certain parts of the house, Doll departed with the turkey and capon, which, however, came no nearer than Holborn to the Fairy Kingdom.

According to Oatmeal Oliver the ceremonies in the house also included some very unseemly business—the trimming of the tripe-wife—wherein a pair of shears and a trivet figured.

Doll, however, over-reached herself in trusting that Mrs. Mescall would be able to restrain her curiosity for three days. Next morning, when she came back with the head and leg of the turkey and was about to perform other mummeries, she was arrested at the instance of the angry widow who had peeped into the yarn; and at this point Doll disappeared from the story into Newgate.

The suitors were not yet defeated. The chase was growing exciting, especially as the old woman had fooled more than one of them. Moreover, several people had by now a financial interest in the wooing of Mrs. Mescall. The bridegroom-to-be was a grocer (whose name is not given by Oliver, probably he was Peters of the depositions), a faint-hearted person, but well supported, amongst his bought friends being the widow's two sisters. The difficulty was to lure her away from her own house to some place where she might be made to compromise herself before witnesses. So 'one of her Sisters, counterfetting a sudden sicknesse, the other (beeing the fatter of the twaine) was made the instrument of fetching her to an intended Banquet: where wine walking lustely about, and manie merrie matters familiarly disputed on, it was set downe for an irreuocable determination, that no remedie, the Tripe-wife must dine next daye at her louers house.'

Thither therefore she went, and was kept so late that the man would not let her go that night. 'But in good sadnes, they are much to blame, that say they whitled her with wine, and so (after some other ceremonies theretoo belonging) drew

'a promise of marriage from her. It is verie vnlike it should  
'bee so, because that night before she went to bed, she pro-  
'tested she would none of him. Oh, but the olde dog helde  
'sure: and though the man himself was somewhat timerous,  
'yet by good instructions he began to chere vp his spirits.

'Now you that be louers, tell mee whether it were a hot  
'signe of loue or no, when the Widdowe (sitting asleepe by the  
'fire) he valiantly (comming behinde her) pulled her stoole  
'from her when downe fell she,<sup>1</sup> and he by or vpon her, with  
'that learned and wittie aduerbe in his mouth, *Keepe the  
'widdow waking*'.

The widow's rest was short. At two o'clock in the morning she was conducted through the cellar and into a boat that was waiting in the river. Thence she was taken to Pepper Alley and so to St. George's Church where she was married, being still apparently too fuddled to realize what was happening. When she recovered her senses there was a loud scene with the fat sister, and the affair gained much publicity generally. The husband having, as he thought, won what he wanted, began to make foolish vaunts of how often he had tricked the tripe-wife. Soon the affair reached the ballad-makers, and the husband was not a little dashed when he heard 'A Iigge for the ballad-mongers to say fresh and fasting, next their hearts euerie morning, insted of a new hunts-vp to giue a good morrow to the Tripe-wife', or, even worse, 'An Eglogue louingly begun and vnluckely ended betweene the Tripe-wife and Trickes her husband.'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This, in a somewhat different form, was one of Puck's little tricks; I do not, however, find it recorded that Mrs. Mescall cried, 'tailor'. As a coincidence it is worth noting that, according to some commentators, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* was written for the wedding of the Earl of Derby on 25 January 1595—the same month as this scandal occurred.

<sup>2</sup> Both are printed in *A Quest of Enquirie*, and the former also in *The Elizabethan Jig*, p. 375.

## JOTTINGS

### CAXTONIANA

Dr. H. J. Smit's *Bronnen tot de Geschiedenis van den Handel met Engeland, Schotland und Irland, 1180-1485*, deserves attention both for its thorough scholarship and on account of the fact that it contains references to yet two more Caxton documents. Dr. Smit has been so kind as to forward me from the Hague a complete transcript of an item for the year 1460 in the *Ordonnantie voor de Vleeshouwers* of Middelburg; it runs as follows :

'Item, XVI dagen in April anno XIII<sup>e</sup> LX is Melis Melis' zone borge geworden voir Willem Caxton, coopman van Lonnen, voir die tolle van 30 duyts yzers, die hij ingesceept hadde in scipper Jacobs scip, 6 gr. voir elc duyts, alsoe hy segde, ende Willem voirsch. heeft gelooft siin borge te quytten. Testes Clais Jacobs zone, burgmeester, Thoren Juustaes zone ende Heinric Jacobs zone.'

This is of particular interest since it was not until 1460 that the English Merchants in Seland were compelled by the Duke of Burgundy to pay a toll on their goods. Caxton's name appears therefore among the first of the merchants for whom their hosts in Seland were willing to stand surety in respect of toll-payment. The sum involved in the 'thousands of iron' is large, being at least £200 in modern currency.

The second Caxton document is printed at length in Dutch in Dr. Smit's book (item 1524) and the subject-matter concerns us little, save that the advice of Caxton is asked by merchants of quite foreign extraction and thus throws a clear light upon his local prestige. But the date of the document is 12 August 1462 and Caxton is named as *meester van den Ingelscher naciën* therein. As I tried to make clear in my articles in *The Library* for March 1927 and March 1928, Caxton had taken over the Governorship very soon after William Obray had been ap-

pointed by Edward IV and named for that office on 1 May of that year. William Blades knew that Caxton was Governor in 1465 and assumed that he was so in 1463. The new document notably limits the dates and also gives grounds for the belief that the document which mentions Caxton as empowered to act for his fellow merchants in July 1462, although not naming him as such, implies that Caxton was acting as the Governor in the third month after O Bray's appointment. (See *The Library*, March 1928, pp. 430-1).

One last point : when Caxton established himself in England he rented rooms in Westminster which had belonged to David Selley, a rich vintner. It is therefore interesting to find a protracted case in the Exchequer Memoranda Rolls (P.R.O. E. 159, 245) in which Selley plays a leading part in receiving smuggled wines which were landed at Thanet, and wherefrom we learn that David Selley was in 1468 buying most of his wines from Seland, where of course Caxton was in control at Middelburg equally as he was at Bruges.

W. J. BLYTH CROTCH.

#### A JACOBAN PRINTER ON CORRECTION AT THE PRESS

An apology of John Beal, the printer of William Gouge's *The Whole Armor of God* (1616) for the typographical errors in that work contains a statement of the manner in which an author corrected his work at the press.<sup>1</sup> The last sentence is of especial interest, in showing that a Jacobean printer realized quite as well as a modern bibliographer the value of comparing copies of the same edition in the search of correct readings of books emended while going through the press.

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of the practice see E. M. Albright, *Dramatic Publication* (1927, pp. 350-6), P. Simpson in *Oxford Bibliographical Soc. Proc.*, II. i (1928), 5-24, and especially R. B. McKerrow, *Introduction to Bibliography* (1928, pp. 207-8).

## THE PRINTER TO THE READER

Good Reader.

I have taken the best care that I could to set fourth this worke in the best manner that I could for true Printing: yet I cannot denie but that some faults have escaped in some copies; such diligence hath been used by the Author in correcting his worke, that so oft as his leasure permitted him, he came himselfe to the Presse, and as he found a fault amended it, so that there are very few faults but that are amended in most of the Bookes. If therefore thou meete with any slippe that may make the sence obscure compare thy Booke with some others and thou maiest find it amended (sig. A10<sup>v</sup>).

EDWIN E. WILLOUGHBY  
*The Newberry Library, Chicago.*

## THE ORIGIN OF ENGLISH PANEL STAMPS

It is a well-known fact that many of the panels on the early sixteenth-century English bindings were cut in the Netherlands, but up to now it has not been possible to connect them with any town abroad. Quite by chance when looking through vol. III of the *Drucker und Verleger Zeichnen des 15. Jahrhunderts*—Munich, 1927, I came across Gerard Leeu—Antwerp—No. 5—the arms of Antwerp flanked by shields containing the Hausmarke and the monogram of Jaspas van Laet. It struck me at once that this latter was very similar to one of the shields in John Reynes, well-known panel of the Arms of the Passion—a favourite Netherland subject—and on comparison this proved to be so. Again Leeu's second device as used at Gouda—helmet, shield, and supporters—appears to me very similar in design and construction to the Reynes panel—so I think one may assume that the panel was definitely cut in the Netherlands, probably by some one connected with Leeu's establishment.

ALBERT EHRLMAN.

## REVIEWS AND NOTICES

*A Game of Chesse* by THOMAS MIDDLETON. Edited by R. C. BALD. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1929. pp. xiv, 173. 12s. 6d. net.

ALL students of Elizabethan and Stuart drama will be grateful to Mr. Bald for this important edition of a highly important text. The play has been twice reprinted before, by Dyce and by Bullen in their collected editions of Middleton's works, and Mr. Bald acknowledges his debt to the former; but he has material to go on not available to them and newer methods at his disposal.

Middleton's *Game of Chesse*, apart from its claims on our attention as a drama and, to use Swinburne's words, 'the only work of English poetry which may properly be called Aristophanic', possesses a threefold interest: political, theatrical, and textual, an interest which is more than usually great in each of these three fields. Mr. Bald gives due weight to them all, but he is clearly most concerned with the third, and as that is the aspect of the play which is likely to appeal more particularly to readers of *The Library* I shall confine myself to it.

Mr. Bald's preoccupation is evident in his preface. After remarking upon the wealth of information which we possess about the play and its production, he continues:

'Its suppression by the authorities, and the consequent surreptitious circulation of copies, both manuscript and printed, have had the result that an editor is confronted with a series of texts unique in their interest. It is a matter of some importance that those who have been engaged on the study of Shakespearian texts are beginning to find that the method of inferring the nature of the original manuscripts from the printed quarto or folio has its limitations, and that valuable aid can be obtained from the study of the extant manuscripts of plays of other writers of the period. The four manuscripts of *A Game of Chesse*, which provide transcripts in the hands of the author and two scribes working under his direction, offer exceptional material for the study of certain types of dramatic texts.'

Nor is this all, for just on the eve of going to press Mr. Bald receives news of yet a fifth manuscript which was sold at Sotheby's on 4 April 1928; and it may well be that other manuscript copies will come to light. Lastly, in addition to the five known manuscripts, three printed quartos have come down to us, belonging to the same period and obviously called for by the great though transient public excitement aroused by the daring satire which the play embodies and by the suppression of the play by the authorities. Here then are eight contemporary publications of the same text, five of them being transcripts authorized by the company or the author, and three of them printed books which Mr. Bald clearly suspects to be of the 'stolne and surreptitious' variety (vide p. 32).

Mr. Bald's great find is the Malone MS. at the Bodleian, the existence of which Bullen knew of but could not trace, for this copy contains autograph dedicatory verses, signed 'T.M.' which enable the editor to claim the Trinity College Library MS. as wholly and the Huntington Library MS. as partly autograph also. Furthermore, this discovery dovetails very neatly into the discovery of Professor F. P. Wilson, set forth in an article in *The Library* for September 1926, that the hand responsible for the Lansdowne MS. at the British Museum and the Malone MS. (apart from the verses aforesaid) belonged to Ralph Crane, who was acting as scrivener to the King's Players between 1619 and 1625. Lastly, Mr. Bald gives reasons for thinking that two of the three quartos were derived from a Middleton MS. and the third from a Crane one. Thus he is able to divide his texts into two packets:

(i) those in Middleton's hand, with or without assistance, or printed from Middleton's MSS.

e. g. the Trinity College MS. (Middleton's hand)  
the Huntington MS. (Middleton and a scribe unknown)  
Quartos I and II.



(ii) those in Crane's hand, or printed from a transcript by Crane.

- e. g. the Lansdowne MS.  
the Malone MS.  
Quarto III.

To which for completeness' sake we should now add

(iii) those in neither Middleton's nor Crane's hand.

- e.g. the manuscript discovered and sold in 1928 (at present the only known representative of this class, which according to Dr. Greg is in the hands of two scribes, neither of them being hands found in the other manuscripts).

On the subject of the printed quartos Mr. Bald is somewhat puzzling, and I suspect that they weigh slightly with him in comparison with the manuscripts, though if one of them was printed direct from a Middleton MS., as he supposes, it is no further removed from 'the first original' than a transcript. 'It is quite possible that all the quartos', he writes, 'were surreptitiously printed.' If by this he means that they were printed without date or printer's name, and without entry in the Stationers' Register, the statement is incontrovertible. But if he means that they may have appeared without the connivance of the author or his company, he adduces no evidence for such a contention beyond their textual imperfections, which he appears to me seriously to exaggerate. Q1 and Q2, for instance, he declares 'teem with mistakes, and are probably much the worst of all the dramatic quartos of the period' (p. 31). To which I can only reply that though I have not made a special study of them, an examination of the copies at the British Museum left me wishing that some of the Shakespearean 'good' quarto and folio texts were as good. Is not Mr. Bald again a little misleading in attempting to distinguish between 'good' and 'bad' quartos in a group which he

suspects to be all 'surreptitious'? He cannot be using these epithets in the sense which Dr. Pollard has given them, and yet he never explains what he means. On the contrary he leaves us baffled with the statement at the head of his Textual Notes that 'No attempt has been made to catalogue all the many and gross errors of the quartos.' Surely a *classified* list of such errors might have been illuminating; the page by page list of variants which he gives following the traditional editorial practice, even if it included 'all the many and gross errors of the quartos', is not enough. Variants taken seriatim tell us little or nothing; arranged in classes according to their similarities they may tell us a great deal.

Mr. Bald's attitude towards the printed texts is the more perplexing in that he admits (p. 36) that while 'no manuscript gives the complete text of the play . . . all the quartos do so', a remark which leaves us wondering whether in taking the Trinity College MS. as the basis of his own text he has not chosen wrongly; for, if the quartos are more complete than the manuscript and if Q1, according to Mr. Bald, was demonstrably printed from the author's autograph, is it not possible, or even likely, that this autograph may have been a more authoritative copy? The real trouble, I fancy, is that like many other editors Mr. Bald has not distinguished either for himself or for us between 'badness' which is due to bad printing and 'badness' which is due to bad printer's copy. To give an example of what I mean, *Hamlet* Q2 which is one of the worst printed of all Shakespearian texts is nevertheless in respect of its copy, unless many of us are very much mistaken, one of the best of the 'good' quartos.

When we come to the manuscripts of *The Game of Chesse*, Mr. Bald is very interesting and helpful, though even here I think there is at times some confusion of thought. In the first place it is clear that all the four manuscripts he has examined, or rather all the five manuscripts known (for the Sotheby copy

is obviously of the same genus as the rest), were transcripts made for patrons or private purchasers, and as they almost certainly belong to late 1624 or early 1625 they are the earliest transcripts of the kind that we know of.<sup>1</sup> And if five such transcripts have survived, there were originally in all probability many more, for the circumstances of the play's production had excited a general interest which could be satisfied for individuals in this way and the author and the company might thus hope to glean a second harvest after the nine days' wonder. In other words, the case of a *Game of Chesse* is so peculiar that it is risky to argue from it to ordinary theatrical practice. Furthermore, if we are rightly to envisage the textual problem which these transcripts raise, we must keep the known facts, and particularly the dates, of the play's production and publication before us. They may be summarized as follows:

1624.

- June 12. *A Game of Chesse* licensed for the King's Men by Herbert.
- Aug. 6. Friday. First public performance at the Globe.
  - 12. Letter from King James (then at Rufford) to Privy Council in response to one from Gondomar, commanding them to take action.
  - 16. Monday. Last public performance at the Globe.
  - 17. Theatre closed by Privy Council and players forbidden to act.
  - 18. Players appear before Privy Council; they give bond for £300 for further appearance; warrant issued for arrest of Middleton, who is in hiding; allowed book of the play confiscated and sent to the King.
  - 27. Globe reopened and players permitted to perform once more.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Prof. F. P. Wilson's article in *The Library*, Sept. 1926, already cited pp. 206-7.

1624.

Aug. 30. Edmund Middleton (son of author) arrested and brought before the Council.

N.B.—According to a note in an old (? contemporary) hand in a copy of a quarto of the play in the Dyce collection, Thomas Middleton and 'the chiefe actors' actually suffered a term of imprisonment.

1625.

Jan. 1. Date of the dedicatory verses written by Middleton at the beginning of the Malone MS. The verses open, 'This which nor Stage, nor Stationers' Stall can shoue', which suggests that all quartos may have been subsequent to this date.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Bald is of opinion 'that the King was never seriously offended' and that his appearance of severity was assumed to please the Spanish authorities. But he makes, I think, too little of the most remarkable of all the remarkable events set forth above, viz., that Sir Henry Herbert should ever have licensed such a play. It seems to me inconceivable that he could have issued the licence unless he had first covered himself completely by securing the approval of the Court; and that he had actually done so is as good as proved by the fact that he does not seem to have suffered the least inconvenience from the whole affair. And if King James or his favourite, Buckingham, approved of the licence, they must have known something of the play. Certainly, Prince Charles and Buckingham were at this time in the mood to find such a play in every way attractive. For they had returned from their visit to Spain late in 1623 and by the summer of 1624 were doing their utmost to drag the old king and a by no means reluctant country into war with their late hosts. Another remarkable feature of the play's history is the long gap of two months between the granting

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Pollard notes that the words leave it possible that quartos had been printed, since stationers might well be afraid to 'shoue' such dangerous matter openly upon their stalls.

of the licence and the first public performance. Mr. Bald's comment upon the interval is 'whether there were delays, or whether this was the normal time taken for the production and rehearsing of a new play, it is impossible to be certain'. Surely the most natural explanation is that the two months were partly taken up with private performances of the play at the instigation of the war party at Court? The Court dispersed generally in the middle or towards the end of July, when it was James's custom to go on progress in the country. Probably the players made careful calculations as regards public performance. They could rely upon non-interference from the Council so long as Gondomar did not get the king to interfere personally; and while James was at Rufford it would take about twelve days for him to receive a letter from London and send an answer in return. As a matter of fact they only played for nine days, since the period contained two Sundays; but if the rumour that they made £1,500 out of the business has any truth in it, the nine days must have been profitable. In a word, the best interpretation of the events outlined in the table above seems to be that Middleton's *Game of Chesse* was itself a pawn in the game of foreign policy which Charles and Buckingham were in 1624 playing against the Spanish ambassador.

These facts and possibilities must be borne in mind in any discussion of the manuscript source or sources of the surviving transcripts. Every one knew that the days of public performance were numbered. Indeed this knowledge is given in a letter from Sir Francis Nethersole to Carleton, dated 14 August, as a reason for the enormous takings at the Globe.<sup>1</sup> And the players also knew that the upshot must be suspension, at least temporarily, together with confiscation of the prompt-book. Is it likely that they made no preparations for this inevitable end? In other words can we entirely rule out of account the

<sup>1</sup> 'The players have gotten 100 li the day knowing ther time cannot be long' (quoted, Bald, p. 161).

possibility, or even the probability, that a second copy of the prompt-book would be got ready before the end came? No doubt the prompt-book was in use in the theatre during the hours of performance, but there were twenty-two hours in the day besides those needed for 'the two hours' traffic of the stage'. And if such a copy were made who so likely to take charge of it as the author, more especially as he had arranged to bestow himself in a safe place of hiding before the blow fell?

In discussing the Huntington transcript Mr. Bald very shrewdly, and I think persuasively, suggests that it was derived like the transcript of Beaumont and Fletcher's *Bonduca* to which Dr. Greg first drew attention of scholars in *The Library* for September 1925, from the 'fowle papers of the Author'. His reason for so thinking is that at 11. ii. 13 the scribe found a gap in his papers, left a page blank, and began the next page where his papers went on, viz. with the opening of Act III. But he had omitted 250 lines, and 'when Middleton was looking over and completing the manuscript' he could not possibly crowd this material into a single page, so that he was obliged to make the best of a bad job by giving three extracts from the omitted passage. But where, we may ask, did Middleton himself get his material for piecing out the imperfections of the scribe? From his memory of his own play? If so, did he also remember the whole of the second and third scenes of the fifth act, some 270 lines, which he likewise added to the transcript? Furthermore, what about the Trinity College transcript, complete and in Middleton's hand throughout? How can that have been copied from the 'fowle papers', if those papers were defective? Is it not certain that the Trinity College and the Huntington transcripts must have been made from different manuscripts, and probable that they were made at different places or times, for had the Huntington scribe been able to consult Middleton's manuscript he could not have acted in the way he did? The similarities which Mr. Bald notes between

the two transcripts can surely be explained by the fact that while the Huntington MS. is a transcript of the foul papers, the Trinity College MS. is, as I suppose, a transcript by the author either of his own prompt-copy, which in turn is derived from the foul papers, or a transcript of that transcript.

I now come to the particular bone which Mr. Bald has to pick with me, and which I naturally regard as the most exciting thing in his exciting book. As I have said his great find is the Malone MS. at the Bodleian. It is a find which has implications far transcending the kind of problems we have been discussing; for, as Mr. Bald triumphantly shows, this transcript is a manuscript of the same nature as those from which Shakespeare's *Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor* were printed in 1623, that is to say it is bare of stage-directions, and its entries are gathered together at the heads of the scenes, wherever the characters may happen to enter. All unsuspecting of 'fowle papers', Mr. Crompton Rhodes and I independently in 1921 attempted to explain these texts on the supposition that they were made up by 'assembling' the players' parts with the help of the playhouse plot. Let me say at once that I am not in the least wedded to this theory. The business of a Shakespearian textual editor, as it seems to me, at the present juncture, is to set the right puzzles; the solutions he himself offers are of very secondary importance. And if Mr. Bald, or any other, can offer a better solution of this puzzle in particular, I shall be sincerely glad, because such manuscripts, though seen most nakedly in the second and third plays of the Folio, lie behind a good many other Shakespearian texts, and it is a nuisance not to feel at all sure with what one is dealing. Now there are several attractive points about the solution which Mr. Bald offers. He attributes the condition of these texts partly to the fact that they are derived from 'fowle papers', but more especially to the idiosyncrasies of Ralph Crane, who as scrivener to the King's Men from 1619 to 1625

may very well have had something to do with the preparation of copy for the First Folio, as indeed Professor F. P. Wilson had already suggested in the article referred to above. Yet, though I can form no final opinion on the matter until I have made a much more thorough examination of the Middleton manuscripts than I have been able to do for this review, I do not at present feel inclined to accept Mr. Bald's solution. My hesitation is chiefly based upon the following reasons:

(i) Mr. Bald establishes a close affinity between the Lansdowne and the Malone MSS., both in the hand of Crane, and claims that they are derived from 'fowle papers' like the Huntington MS. How many lots of foul papers go to a play? It is true that both the Crane transcripts omit the same scene (III. ii), and that such omissions suggest the use of foul papers. But the foul papers used *ex hypothesi* for the Huntington transcript omitted 250 lines of II. ii, together with presumably the last two scenes of the play. Did Crane make use of a second lot of foul papers? The theory will not work here any more than it will for the Trinity College MS.

(ii) Though the two Crane transcripts are very similar in some respects they are very different in others. The most striking of these differences is that while the Lansdowne MS., with the exception of the omitted scene just referred to is a full text, the Malone MS. is drastically abridged, being 770 lines short of the complete play. 'The cuts', writes Mr. Bald, 'have been made with considerable skill, and if there were no other texts one would never suspect that so many lines had been omitted.' And he seeks to explain them as having been 'made with Middleton's consent at a time when there was a demand for copies of the play, and it was easier and more profitable to multiply it in an abbreviated form'. In view of the fact that there are four other transcripts extant all of them without these cuts, and also of the fact that three out of the five omit scenes apparently without very much compunction for the



private purchaser, I find it difficult to accept this explanation. The obvious one is that such cuts were made for performance. 'But we know all about the performances of this play' it will be objected. We certainly know all about the *public* performances. But we have already seen reason for suspecting the existence of private performances in June or July 1624, and is there any real difficulty in imagining further private performances after 17 August of a play which every one in London who had not seen it was burning to see and which had been only half-heartedly suppressed by the authorities?

(iii) Mr. Bald has failed to notice one curious similarity between the two Crane transcripts. The Malone MS. as he points out, is not entirely bare of stage-directions, for it contains some half-dozen here and there, together with one or two exits. Now it is a remarkable fact that in the Lansdowne MS. all these directions, with the exception of one brief one at iv. i. 109 ('Enter agen'), and *no others*, are written in the same style (secretary) and with the same pen as the dialogue, while for all the other stage-directions in this text Crane employs a bold Roman written with what seems to be another pen. The two styles are so distinct that at first sight they seem to have been written by different hands, and though the presence of both in the description of the dumb-show (iv. iii) makes the notion difficult, I cannot help suspecting that Crane wrote them at different times. In any case, the fact that the Malone MS. omits the directions in one style in the Lansdowne MS. and includes the directions in another style, suggests that the two lots of directions were somehow derived by Crane from different sources. In other words it seems to lend support to the assembled-text theory. For it is all very well for Mr. Bald to talk of Crane's idiosyncrasies. I can do so too. Let us suppose, for example, that he had been employed in 1623 and earlier in making up texts for the printers of the First Folio out of players' parts and plots, where the prompt-book was not

available, what more natural than that he should offer to do the same thing in 1624-5 when there was a great demand for transcripts of *A Game of Chesse*?

(iv) Mr. Bald writes, 'The close relationship existing between these two texts, although one of them is drastically abbreviated and in an unusual form, compels the abandonment of the "assembled-text" theory.' This I do not follow. He says on an earlier page 'the evidence suggests that both were copied from the same source, perhaps an intermediate transcript by Crane'. Very good. Let us suppose again that behind the Crane transcripts, at one or two removes if you like, there lies a Crane manuscript compiled from players' parts and the plot, because the king has the allowed book, and Middleton has taken off his own copy, and the foul papers were found to be defective for acting purposes. And let us suppose that in the parts he used there were a few stage-directions, would there be any difficulty in his making copies of this for sale, and filling in the stage-directions under the instructions of those who had acted the play, or abridging it for a private performance and then making a copy of that abridgement for sale again?

There are many other points that might be taken up. And Mr. Bald may think that I have shirked dealing with some of his arguments. But enough for a review! All I will say in conclusion that I have by no means finished my game of chess yet, and that I confidently expect many other students will be wanting to take a hand in it, now Mr. Bald has shown us all the way.

J. D. W.

*Die Typen der Inkunabelzeit. Eine Betrachtung.* Von ERNST CONSENTIUS. pp. 160. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1929. 80. 16 marks in paper covers, 18 marks bound.

THE central propositions of this book can be fairly summarized in the words of the publisher's advertisement: by no means

every printer of the fifteenth century was the maker of his own type, many printers were unable to make type for themselves and the same type not uncommonly passed through the hands of several printers in succession. These propositions contain nothing very startling, but the author will have it that they completely invalidate what he calls the Bradshaw-Proctor-Haebler method of taking the types of anonymous incunabula as the basis of their attribution to presses, a method which, he quite unreasonably insists, is rooted in the assumption that every earlier printer cut and cast his own founts. However exact the typographical correspondence between an unsigned book and another book signed by a given printer, we can never, in effect, be sure (there being no positive evidence to the contrary) that the latter may not have meanwhile sold the type, or hired it out, or had it distrained upon, or parted with it for some other reason, and scientific integrity therefore requires us to ignore the possible connexion altogether. The method elaborated in Proctor's *Index* and Dr. Haebler's *Typenrepertorium* is, in fact, 'keine wissenschaftliche Tat'; the *Index* is useful only so long as we disregard all the entries referring to anonymous editions, and the *Typenrepertorium* stands convicted of failing even to mention a variety of printers who appear in records as the possessors of type. Thus, to quote the publisher once more, the work of Herr Consentius will compel the study of incunabula to be orientated afresh.

It is difficult to take all this seriously, for Herr Consentius is so obviously lacking in first-hand knowledge of incunabula or of the problems involved in their study. Before Proctor the early history of the press was admittedly in a chaotic state, and the typological method which he used in his *Index* was the result of his conviction that no effort to rescue it from that state could be successful until 'something had been done in the direction' of distinguishing and listing the types found in the books. While regarding this as his principal task, he was well

aware that other evidence, internal or documentary, must also be taken into account as far as possible, but all subsequent work upon incunabula, from whatever point of view, has served to vindicate the method of the *Index* as an entirely reasonable working hypothesis and in general a most reliable guide. It ought to be superfluous to add that the study of early printing is a branch of antiquarian research and therefore cannot be expected to yield absolute results like those of experimental science. But Herr Consentius, it seems, was deceived by certain ill-advised enthusiasts who cried it up as having reached 'an almost mathematical certainty', and in his vexation at finding it very largely empirical and approximate after all, he wrote this book, in which he makes a dead set at the accepted methods of investigation, with a special seasoning of polite sneers at the work of Dr. Haebler.

Learning is not advanced a jot by such impertinences, and Herr Consentius is entirely barren of constructive suggestions, beyond proclaiming the supreme importance of documentary evidence in terms which imply that he himself is the first to appreciate its true value. On the other hand, when he enlarges on technical processes, with quotations from the records, he can be read with some profit, in spite of his extreme discursiveness. We are made to realize, for instance, how rapidly after the earliest years each branch of the craft passed into the specialist's hands: the punch-cutter might never touch a matrix, the matrix might be struck by one man and justified by another, journeymen might or might not have a knowledge of type-casting. We see the sale, hire, or loan of the finished type in bulk to be such a common transaction that evidently many, if not most, printers found it simpler to procure their stock of type from outside rather than cast it themselves. Herr Consentius is at pains to infer from this the existence of entirely separate and independent type-foundries, but, as Dr. Haebler has pointed out, there is no evidence for the existence of a 'Schriftgiessergewerbe' as

such and in all probability the few leading firms in each centre who possessed a virtual monopoly of the trade combined this class of work with their other activities. Again, we are usefully reminded of the almost insuperable difficulties which at this period must have surrounded any attempt to copy a type-face exactly in all its details—from which it follows that a good many types usually described only as ‘indistinguishable’ from one another are really identical in the sense that they all derive from a single set of matrices or punches, even though they may not be actually of the same cast, and, further, that instruments and material, at any rate in the last quarter of the fifteenth century, readily passed not merely from firm to firm locally but also from one printing centre to another. This is perfectly consistent with the evidence derived from the books themselves in respect, say, of the distribution of type-faces over Venetia and Lombardy or in the cities along the Rhine.

It would lead too far to discuss here the numerous wider problems raised by all this, such as the printers’ readiness, on the face of it so unbusinesslike, to discard their founts at frequent intervals and to modify them in small details for aesthetic reasons at the cost of a fresh punch and matrix for each change, or the very large number of persons known to have possessed a printing outfit of whose productions nothing appears to have survived. There may, however, be room for one or two suggestions. Thus it is certain that great quantities of broadsheets, handbills, and similar matter have in the course of nature perished entirely which must have afforded at any rate part-time employment to a good many jobbing printers unknown to typographical history: the number of small pamphlets now lost, the printing of which is recorded in the day-book of the Ripoli Press at Florence, is sufficient evidence of this, to take only one instance. As for the punches, we are very likely in the habit of putting their commercial value too high. Labour, even the skilled labour required for punch-cutting, was cheap;

moreover, fashions in type-faces had a way of changing. There is a well-known passage in Jenson's will directing that the 'ponzoni' of his much-admired roman are to go as a personal bequest to his friend Peter Ugelnsheimer. Herr Consentius quotes this as proof that the punches were something specially valuable, but it is not at all impossible that their value was merely that of a curiosity: at any rate the fact remains (Herr Consentius characteristically ignores it) that at this very time the type ceased to be used, although the Colonia-Jenson Company, who retained the matrices, as well as Ugelnsheimer himself presumably, must have had it in their power to make a fresh cast of it whenever they chose. These and many other problems of early typography still await their full solution and incunabulists would welcome co-operation in solving them; but Herr Consentius must learn and unlearn a great deal before he can be more than quite incidentally helpful.

V. S.